

2376. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mr. Walter C. Peterson, clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to urging the Senators and Representatives from California, wholly or partially representing districts in the city of Los Angeles, to support the recommendations of the President and comply with his request for an immediate additional appropriation for the work of the FBI in detecting plots of sabotage, spying, and infiltration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and blessed God, in the midst of the toiling days when the fever and fret of perilous times take their toll of bodies and spirits, we are grateful for quiet arbors of peace where, at an altar of contrition, we may bow for Thy forgiveness and cleansing.

In an hour when such vast issues are at stake may those who here serve, conscious of the great tradition in which they stand, rise to greatness of vision and soul as the anxious eyes of all the nations are upon this Chamber. We would join our petitions with unnumbered hosts today, under all skies, at the opening of the General Assembly of the United Nations, that in spite of all attempts to sabotage its mandates this world agency may be the instrument in Thy hand of averting war, of increasing understanding and of enlarging the field of peaceful cooperation among the nations. We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, September 18, 1950, was dispensed with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the session of the Senate until 3 o'clock this afternoon so that I may attend a luncheon which is being given to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by the American Bar Association committee on the Federal Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEM was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. RUSSELL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today to consider the nomination of Gen. George C. Marshall to be Secretary of Defense.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hill	Maione
Benton	Hoey	Martin
Butler	Holland	Millikin
Byrd	Humphrey	Morse
Cain	Hunt	Mundt
Chapman	Ives	Murray
Chavez	Jenner	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Donnell	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kem	Saltonstall
Dworschak	Kerr	Schoeppel
Eaton	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Langer	Stennis
Ferguson	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	Lehman	Thye
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	McCarran	Tydings
Gillette	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Young

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a temporary alternate Governor of the World Bank.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate as representatives of the American group to the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session

of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement concerning a bill sponsored by the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. GRAHAM], with respect to a new plan for acreage allotment on peanuts.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to hear the Senator speak, but I thought we were to have a period for insertions in the RECORD and other routine matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is correct. The Senator from Virginia can be recognized on the pending bill to make the address.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the situation, and I reserve my comments.

UNITED STATES CIVIL DEFENSE—REFERENCE OF MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT, REPORT, AND BILL

The message from the President of the United States, dated September 18, 1950, transmitting to the Congress the report entitled "United States Civil Defense," yesterday ordered to lie on the table, was, with the accompanying report and the bill (S. 4162) to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes, referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Pension Clubs and the senior citizens of Duval County, at Jacksonville, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of David H. Heydenburk, of Houghton, N. Y., remonstrating against the appointment and confirmation of a special representative to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by E. E. Ferrari, secretary-treasurer, embodying a resolution adopted by the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities, relating to Panama Canal tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Department of California, the American Legion, in convention assembled at Sacramento, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 87, relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 4165. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to bring to Washington, D. C.,

theater productions of land-grant colleges and universities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 4166. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended, with respect to housing accommodations in hotels and housing accommodations resulting from conversion; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 4167. A bill to authorize the waiver of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws;

S. 4168. A bill to authorize the construction and equipment of a geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce; and

S. 4169. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) introduced S. J. Res. 206, authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance funds for international children's welfare work pending the making of the appropriation authorized by title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, which was ordered to lie on the table and appears under a separate heading.)

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE WORK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I have been requested to introduce a joint resolution to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance funds for international children's welfare work pending the making of the appropriation authorized by title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, together with an explanatory statement by me. At the proper time I shall ask that it be taken up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and lie on the table, and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 206) authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance funds for international children's welfare work pending the making of the appropriation authorized by title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, was read twice by its title, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of such title, in such manner, at such time, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged

on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds hereafter appropriated for the purposes of such title.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE WORK

A most unfortunate and unhappy accident has occurred. The United Nations Children's Fund which has had one of the most outstanding records of achievement of any international body and which today is carrying the American flag and the flags of 43 other contributing countries around the world on behalf of assistance to children has been dropped from the supplemental appropriation bill.

Something must be done if possible before Congress closes to repair this most unhappy situation.

Of all international aid, or national American aid, in which our country has participated, none has been more effective, economical, and may I say sternly realistic, than the assistance given by the United Nations Children's Fund. Though this basically is a great humanitarian work, no organization has worked so hard with the funds entrusted to it to draw in every possible initiative and to develop respect and self-reliance within the receiving countries. This fund is operated under the principle of helping others to help themselves, each time expecting the maximum of initiative and the highest degree of matching within the receiving countries. In countries that were war-torn it has not furnished woolen clothing, but raw wool from New Zealand; which was made into cloth and clothing with the labor of the receiving country and then distributed to the neediest children in that country. It has not furnished shoes, but leather from Australia. It has not furnished layettes, but raw cotton from the United States.

The United States so far over a period of 3 years has put \$75,000,000 into this operation. Other donor governments have put in a total representing the equivalent of \$30,000,000. The receiving countries themselves, even those devastated by war or suffering from great economic problems have put up the equivalent of over \$100,000,000.

All this work of the United Nations Children's Fund, together with the long-term measures which it has stimulated in 60 countries, on behalf of children, represents the highest of American traditions. The funds raised by this organization have been entirely allocated. If we do not provide enabling legislation in this session of Congress, its work must cease the end of December in the Middle East, where it has been furnishing the greater part of the help to 500,000 refugee children and its work in several other countries where stoppage in mid-winter threatened.

This work of the Children's Fund up to now has meant health, and often even life, to millions of children. It has brought great credit upon the United Nations and the United States as its principal contributor. This legislation, authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances against Public Law 535, will enable the program to continue until the Congress reconvenes and an appropriation is finalized to carry out the terms of the authorization.

AUTHORIZATION OF AGREEMENTS PROVIDING FOR UNION MEMBERSHIP AMONG RAILWAY EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. TAFT) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill

(S. 3295) to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deductions from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes and under certain conditions, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

JUSTICE FOR POLAND—STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject, Justice for Poland, by Senator SMITH of New Jersey, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SENATORS FROM WYOMING—EDITORIAL BY R. F. MACPHERSON

[Mr. MCFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Example of Teamwork," written by R. F. MacPherson and published in the Wyoming Eagle of September 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS—COMMENT BY ARTHUR KROCK ON REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "An Example of Congress at Its Best," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of September 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN DOLLARS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NATIONAL GRANGE MONTHLY

[Mr. CORDON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dollars," written by Albert S. Goss, National Grange master, and published in the National Grange monthly of September 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RED CHANNELS BECOMES BEST SELLER—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him and an article from the Christian Science Monitor discussing the news letter entitled "Counter Attack," which appear in the Appendix.]

A BOY DIED LAST NIGHT—EDITORIAL FROM THE BURLEY (IDAHO) BULLETIN

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Boy Died Last Night," written by John B. Cook, editor of the Burley (Idaho) Bulletin, and published in that newspaper on September 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFENSE OF EUROPE BY AMERICAN MANPOWER—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Britain, France Want Europe Defended, But at Expense of American Manpower," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRACT BETWEEN SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION AND OKLAHOMA UTILITY COMPANIES

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD letters addressed by L. J. Wilhoite and Ken G. Whitaker to Hon. Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, relating to a contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and Oklahoma utility companies, which appear in the Appendix.]

VETERANS OF THE EIGHTH WAR—EDITORIAL FROM MONTGOMERY (ALA.) ADVERTISER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Veterans of the Eighth War," published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of September 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFORMATION PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE—ARTICLE FROM DALLAS (TEX.) MORNING NEWS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Texans Air Nation's Voice," written by David Botter, and published in the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of August 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—ADDRESS BY CHARLES BAKER

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Charles Baker, at Walla Walla, Wash., on September 11, 1950, on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECHOES FROM THREATENED RAILROAD STRIKE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a statement dated August 24, 1950, addressed to New York Central System employees by G. Metzman, president of the New York Central System, and a copy of a letter dated September 1, sent to Mr. Metzman by W. P. Kennedy, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, which appear in the Appendix.]

NEHRU'S IDEAS FOR PEACE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nehru's Ideas for Peace," published in the United States News and World Report on September 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN COMBATING CRIME—ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Role of the Federal Government in Combating Crime, delivered by Attorney General McGrath, before the criminal law section of the American Bar Association, September 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MENACE OF ORGANIZED CRIME—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Menace of Organized Crime, delivered by him before the criminal law section of the American Bar Association, September 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY ROBERT C. ALBRIGHT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a few days ago the subcommittee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON), which had been appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to check upon the workings of our preparedness program, made its first report. I commend this report to all the Members of the Senate for their reading. The report manifests a thorough and nonpartisan approach which is so essential to the success of this important work. More

than that, it demonstrates how a committee of the Congress can be effective in assisting the executive branch of the Government in expediting the preparedness program, and effecting economies at the same time. The report is a harbinger of greater accomplishments in the days which lie ahead.

Mr. President, a notable news article has appeared in recent days regarding the work of this committee. It was written by Mr. Robert C. Albright, and appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, September 17. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE'S NEW WAR PRODDERS LIE LOW BUT HIT HARD

(By Robert C. Albright)

If waffle-bottomed Washington is beginning to rise out of its swivel chair, a new congressional committee may have something to do with it.

Seven Senators, with a knack for prodding the war effort by dragging out and exposing uncomfortable facts, have scattered tacks in more than one official seat in and out of Government.

More than that, President Truman, who rose to fame by jabbing at soft spots in Defense Department programs back in World War II, is helping them do it.

In fact, the Senate's Johnson preparedness committee is a new version of the old Truman committee.

It has the same all for one and one for all bipartisan rules, puts quiet inquiries into what's wrong with the defense pace ahead of headline hunting.

So anonymously hush-hush has it worked that its recent preliminary report on shortcomings in surplus disposal and rubber stockpiling caught Washington by surprise, served notice that the postwar siesta was over.

A SCORCHING COMMENTARY

Here's what it said about one Washington agency which let 3 weeks go by without even replying to its urgent inquiries:

"Either the Munitions Board has a program or it has not. If it has a program it could readily be described. If it has no program it should be candidly admitted. In any event, if the diligence with which the Munitions Board addressed itself to our inquiry is any measure of the manner in which it attends to its other duties, its competence would seem to leave something to be desired."

It told how it received a polite brush-off from the Air Force on one occasion, said the Defense Department lacked any real surplus disposal policy, hit sale of surplus synthetic-rubber plants, airplane engines, and radio equipment needed in the war effort.

Since the report, the group hasn't received any more brushoffs, and in official Washington, anyway, there's been a noticeable diminution of business as usual.

Its key rubber recommendations are already being put into effect and the committee is launching "task force" investigations in these other fields: Alaskan defenses, critical items of arm and equipment, foreign cartel monopolies in strategic items, basic manpower problems, and steel and stockpiling needs.

At least one top official who gave the committee a rough time, former Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, is no longer in the Cabinet, although the seven-man group claims no hand in his resignation.

ADVICE FROM OLD HAND

Mr. Truman from the start has made it abundantly clear to all around him that he is cooperating with the committee. He

received all seven members at the White House to tell them so. As an old hand at the defense investigating business, he gave them a few tips, told them the White House door was always open to them.

Mr. Truman advised them that if Truman committee history repeats itself, as it seems to be doing, the new investigating group will be up against two problems:

1. Individually and as a unit, they will find it hard to stick to their own knitting, but should try to do it anyway. They should avoid like the plague either telling the generals how to fight their battles the morning after they are fought, or slipping over into the field of foreign policy.

2. Time and again in the course of their inquiries, they will run into resistance to change. Some people, having taken a position, just don't like to change it, even if it's later proved to be wrong, he told them.

In its bare 6 weeks of existence, the new group has found both problems to be real. As for Truman tip No. 1, the committee already had a rule against Monday-morning quarterbacking, to date has lived up to it. Its main problem, well-put in Truman tip No. 2, has been how to overcome stubborn resistance to change, particularly in the military.

HEADED HOUSE INQUIRY

As Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas, 42-year-old chairman of the preparedness committee, put it:

"Our big job is to get the defense effort away from hardening of the arteries of imagination and ingenuity."

Though a freshman, only 2 years in the Senate, JOHNSON is no novice at defense probing. As a Member of the House, he headed the old Naval Affairs Subcommittee investigation of World War II defense efforts. That inquiry got plenty of results, but little publicity.

The late James Forrestal, Navy Secretary at the time, called its work illustrative of the cooperation that should and can exist between the executive and legislative branches of Government * * * an adjunct and an asset to the Navy Department.

Unlike the Truman inquiry, which had a special committee status, the Senate's new preparedness group is actually a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The three Democrats and three Republicans serving with Johnson on the subcommittee represent a cross-section of the Senate's best talent in many diverse fields. Three of them, like JOHNSON, are freshmen, all the more on their toes because they are out to make their Senate mark.

OTHER HOUSE GRADUATES

Senator VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN, Democrat, Kentucky, came to the Senate only 2 years ago but previously served 24 years in the House. Speaker SAM RAYBURN rated him "most valuable member" of his old House Interstate Commerce Committee.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, like CHAPMAN, crossed over from the House in the last election. He has 10 years of enlightened House service behind him, has already demonstrated his talent for sleuthing as chairman of the Senate's Kefauver crime committee.

Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Democrat, Wyoming, served as Governor of his State for 6 years before coming to the Senate 2 years ago, rising via the State legislature route. He's one of the Senate's lesser known, harder working Members.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, is the unit's lone veteran of the old Truman committee, outranks in seniority every other Senate Republican save ARTHUR VANDENBERG. BRIDGES was the first Senate Republican called in when the administration decided to fight back in Korea.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Republican, Oregon, came to the Senate in 1944 after serving as public member of the National War Labor Board. One of the sharpest legal minds in

the Senate, MORSE previously taught argumentation and law, was dean of the University of Oregon Law School.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, Massachusetts, was three times Governor of his State before he came to the Senate 6 years ago. Gentle, diplomatic, SALTONSTALL helps cement the committee's bipartisan unanimity.

TOP-FLIGHT COUNSEL

Rounding out "investigation task force" is Donald C. Cook, the 41-year-old chief counsel. Since the committee is shy of funds, Cook is working without pay, on a part-time basis. His regular full-time job: Vice Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Cook served as chief counsel for the old House Naval Affairs Committee's defense investigation, where JOHNSON first worked with him. Cook's appointment was a good example of the committee's bipartisan team play. Knowing JOHNSON wanted Cook for counsel, Senator BRIDGES, the Texan's opposite number politically, made the motion that led to his appointment.

The committee's initial investigation, of the surplus disposal program, also came on BRIDGES' motion.

Cook, unable to serve in the Armed Forces in World War II because of poor vision, received his highest tribute from Chairman CARL VINSON (Democrat, Georgia) of the House Armed Services Committee when he concluded his job for the old JOHNSON subcommittee.

Said VINSON:

"Your satisfaction in a job well done for us must come from an inner satisfaction which is not decorated by medals or diplomas or put on parchment paper. We of the committee know that you manned your battle station."

As the investigation continues, the committee will draw on all the top-flight World War II experience it can reach. Men like Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War; Robert M. Littlejohn, General Eisenhower's quartermaster general, and Col. R. L. Harrison, the Agriculture Department's former ace food expert, may help the committee, in an advisory way, to guard against the defense mistakes of the past.

With President Truman cooperating with—in fact rooting for—the war investigating team like an old grad, chances are that official Washington will, too.

The last business-as-usual signs may come off war-related programs, and Washington may lose that waffle-bottom squat.

Until it does, the committee is plentifully supplied with tacks, and men who know where to put them.

An intensive program of investigations will spread over the remaining 3 months of this year.

A study of Alaskan defenses is just getting under way, directed by Senator HUNT. Senators MORSE and SALTONSTALL will accompany him to Alaska to probe for weak links in a vital area.

They will take a look at airfields, troops, and equipment, military-civilian relations, radar protection, housing and roads. All the time they will keep an eye out for subversive elements.

Although MORSE is up for reelection, he will skip any October campaigning, hope the gods are with him on election day. Anyway, he told the committee, Alaskan defenses are more important.

Another task force, headed by JOHNSON, will stay here in Washington and open hearings in October on ordnance problems. KEFAUVER and BRIDGES will work with JOHNSON on this study of the status of our weapons.

This three-man unit will try to find out where we stand in research, development, and utilization of critical items of arms and equipment, including bazookas, grenades, long-range projectiles, rockets, guided missiles and tanks.

"We cannot continue to be caught with inadequate plans and inadequate imagination in a world which threatens to catch fire," JOHNSON said.

Besides continuing its studies of surplus disposal kinks, rubber and other stockpiling, the committee will dig into these other defense problems:

Manpower: What is the policy and what plans are being made to get the necessary manpower for total mobilization? Shouldn't high physical standards be dropped for some forms of noncombatant service? Couldn't a man with a slight disability stand guard as well as a class A physical specimen?

Cartels: To what extent are foreign monopolies in items we must have for the war effort, raising our costs for rubber and other strategic items?

Steel: Do we have enough steel capacity in this country for future armament programs and domestic use as well? Where should we strike a balance?

All are aimed at what Alumnus Investigator Harry Truman told the seven-man group was the prime object of his World War II inquiry. He said he hoped this would be the chief goal of the Senate's new one.

"How to get the most efficient, economical, and honest defense effort possible."

Said JOHNSON: "That's all that we're trying to do."

THE PEANUT MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the views so ably expressed on the floor of the Senate on September 13—page 14666 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date—by the able junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] concerning S. 3135. That bill seeks to remedy a situation which unless remedied will undoubtedly destroy the support program for peanuts. It provides for the separation of peanuts into three general classes and allows the Department of Agriculture to put into effect acreage control based upon available markets for each class.

Virginia and North Carolina produce class No. 1 which includes the Virginia type of Jumbo peanut and the Valencia type, both of which are edible peanuts with only the culls being crushed for oil.

The State of Georgia produces the Runner type which is used exclusively for the production of oil. Virginia was producing edible peanuts when no peanuts whatever were being produced in Georgia because the crushing of peanuts for oil on a commercial basis did not begin in the United States until shortly before World War I. Shortly before the beginning of World War I less than 500,000 pounds a year of peanuts were crushed for oil. By 1918 it had increased to 96,000,000 pounds. But since there was no support price and peanut oil in normal times could not successfully compete with other types of vegetable oil the production dropped to 14,000,000 pounds. Then after a support price was provided the amount increased rapidly until it reached the astounding figure of 100,000,000 pounds a year and has continued since the end of World War II at substantially that rate although there was no commercial market at a fair price for the entire product.

As a result the peanut support price program has cost the taxpayers of this

Nation nearly \$140,000,000, the figure for the last crop being approximately \$39,000,000. The support program for the 1949 crop in the four States in the southeastern area that produce oil peanuts cost \$26,205,000 and amounted to a subsidy of \$23.93 per acre.

Every Member of this honorable body knows that the Congress cannot indefinitely continue to pay the farmers of that area an average subsidy of \$20.93 per acre to produce peanuts for oil making purposes for which there is no need and no market. That is the reason I have stated that unless we can adjust this program on a fair and equitable basis the program is going to be wrecked.

The present control program, while inadequate to control the overproduction of the types of peanuts crushed for oil, has nearly put the Virginia and North Carolina growers of peanuts out of business although the market for edible peanuts is so strong that we are importing some peanuts of that type with which to meet the demand.

As previously indicated, Virginia was growing edible peanuts when no peanuts whatever were being grown in Georgia. But under the current control program, which will be made even more drastic next year, Virginia is now devoting a smaller acreage to peanuts than she did in 1909. In 1948 the Virginia acreage was 164,000 acres. In 1950 it had been cut to 141,108 acres, and, as previously indicated, another cut is coming up for 1951. But what has happened in Georgia? I do not have the Georgia figures for 1948 but for 1950 the Georgia allotment was in excess of 800,000 acres. That situation was so palpably unfair that the Senate Agriculture Committee reported the Hoey-Graham bill by a unanimous vote. I predict that when the Senate is permitted to vote on the bill, it will pass the bill by an overwhelming majority. Far be it from me to criticize any distinguished colleague whose State is enjoying a great advantage in this peanut program for being reluctant to relinquish it. I do feel justified, however, in saying to those who take this position that the peanut-oil program in Georgia and other southeastern areas cannot possibly survive without a support price and that we are heading for the time when the entire support program will be abolished.

Personally, I do not want to see the Georgia and Alabama producers of oil peanuts wrecked. On the other hand, I do not want to see the Virginia and North Carolina producers of edible peanuts wrecked. Under a no-support program the producers of edible peanuts, for which there is a strong market, will, of course, have a better chance for survival than the producers of the oil types. But a fairer program is proposed for all producers under S. 3135, and, in my opinion, the Congress should write that bill into law before the commencement of another planting year.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a statement?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I desire to associate myself with my colleague, who has made a very able presentation of the peanut situation affecting Virginia, and say that I heartily agree with him.

LIST OF PENNSYLVANIA NATIONAL GUARDSMEN WHO DIED IN THE OHIO TROOP-TRAIN WRECK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Wyoming Valley of my State is resuming its everyday activity, bearing calmly and courageously the burden of tragedy and sorrow which came suddenly last week when 33 of its soldier sons were killed in the Ohio troop-train wreck.

Senators will recall that these fine young men were all members of the One Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery Battalion of the Twenty-eighth Division, the Pennsylvania National Guard. Their

mortal remains have now been laid to rest, each with the solemn rites of his religious faith and with full military honors.

Mr. President, I feel it is proper at this time to inform my colleagues that Pennsylvania spared no effort to acknowledge its great debt to those who died in the service of their country. I feel it is proper also to praise the efficient manner in which all arrangements were handled by the adjutant general of Pennsylvania, Maj. Gen. Frank A. Weber, and his staff. Everything possible was done that could bring to the stricken parents,

wives, and other relatives a measure of comfort and solace.

I am sure that in the heart of every American there is the deepest sympathy for those who were bereaved by the terrible tragedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point in my remarks the names of these Pennsylvania boys who died for freedom in the same patriotic spirit as their comrades who face the enemy in Korea.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Battery B, One Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery Battalion

Rank	Name	Serial No.	Home address	Next of kin
Warrant officer	William W. Wellington	W6847780	122 John St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. Leah Belle Wellington (mother).
Sergeant	John W. Cox	20316877	38 McDonald St., West Plymouth, Pa.	Mrs. Mary Cox (mother).
Do	William C. Edwards	33358869	600 Schuylcr Ave., Kingston, Pa.	Mrs. Charles Edwards (mother), 94 Amburst Ave., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
Do	Gilbert B. Wharton	23814614	64 North Main St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. Daisey Mae Wharton (mother).
Corporal	Larry L. Luzenski	23814667	125 Carverton Rd., Trucksville, Pa.	Mrs. Sue Luzenski (mother).
Private first class	Leonard Balonis	23814690	319 Maffett St., Plains, Pa.	Mrs. Anna Balonis (mother).
Do	Harold Handlos	23814703	22 East Luzerne Ave., Larksville, Pa.	Mrs. Bertha Handlos (mother).
Do	Clyde P. Harding	57201273	65 Union St., Kingston, Pa.	Mrs. Catherine R. Harding (wife).
Do	Ronald J. Jackson	23814695	942 East Northampton St., Laurel Run, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. Laura Jackson (mother).
Do	Raymond Pudlowski	23814683	19 New St., Hudson, Pa.	Mr. Rome Pudlowski (father).
Do	Donald C. Zieker	23814689	17 Central St., Hughestown, Pa.	Mrs. Dorothy Zieker (mother).
Recruit	Hugh L. Fargus	23814735	49 Gerard Ave., Plymouth, Pa.	Mrs. Mary Jones (mother).
Do	Charles Norton	23814739	216 Penn St., Lee Park, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. Marie Norton (wife).
Do	Richard A. Royer	23814733	313 Bowman St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. John Royer (mother).
Sergeant	Lester J. Kuehn	23813290	24 North Empire St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. Arlene Kuehn (wife).
Recruit	Frank C. Martinez	23814729	510 Fox St., Bronx, New York, N. Y.	Mrs. Lucile Martinez (mother).
Do	Eugene Carr	23814737	114 Wilson St., Larksville, Pa.	Mrs. Catherine Carr (wife).
Do	William J. Dougherty	23814736	185 Nesbitt St., Larksville, Pa.	Mrs. Charles Dougherty (mother).
Private first class	Martin F. Hornlein	23814685	92 S. Washington St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mr. Martin Hornlein (father).
Do	Edmund Zabicki	33108177	177 Zerby Ave., Edwardsville, Pa.	Mrs. Bertha Zabicki (mother).
Recruit	William F. Sobers	23814732	48 Laurel St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mr. William Sobers (father).

Service Battery, One Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery Battalion

Rank	Name	Serial No.	Home address	Next of kin
Captain	Arthur J. Thomas	O12955459	79 Price St., Kingston, Pa.	Mrs. Sally Thomas (wife).
Warrant officer	James P. McGinley	No ASN	207 Bennett St., Exeter, Pa.	Mrs. James F. McGinley (wife).
Corporal	Joseph E. Fletcher	23815870	1287 Scott St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mr. Merson Fletcher (father).
Do	Thomas M. Ostraszewski	23815869	1486 Scott St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. Helen Ostraszewski (mother).
Private first class	Edward W. Gallagher	No ASN	581 West 8th St., West Wyoming, Pa.	Mrs. Edward W. Gallagher (wife).
Private	William F. Tierney	23815872	23 East Jackson St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. Anna Tierney (grandmother).
Recruit	Thomas W. Wallace	23815880	204 Main St., Kingston, Pa.	Mrs. Estelle Wallace (mother).
Sergeant	Bernard S. Okrasinski	23815813	40 Brazil St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. Stanley Okrasinski (mother).
Corporal	John L. Barna	23815817	49 McHale St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. John L. Barna (wife), 164 Abbott St., Plains, Pa.
Private	William R. Disbrow	23815878	87 East Northampton St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Mrs. Eleanor Disbrow (mother).
Do	Wallace R. Ludwig	23815878	382 Osceola Ave., Kingston, Pa.	Mr. Wallace Ludwig (father).
Corporal	Carl W. Armbruster	43043302	132 Maffett St., Plains, Pa.	Mr. Carl Armbruster (father).

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, there is a lesson in Americanism in this list of honored names.

It reflects the diverse national origins that are bound together in the greatness of our country.

It is indicative of the best traditions of American freedom, tolerance, and respect for the rights and religious beliefs of our neighbors.

As I read the list I found names of English origin, Irish, Scotch, Welsh, German, Spanish, Polish, and Slavish countries, and others.

America is so fortunate that real Americanism is distilled in the great melting pot of our Nation.

If the people of our Republic remain united in patriotic purpose and are guided by high moral and spiritual principles the world will be freed of the Godless Communist philosophy, and peace, with freedom and justice, will be restored.

EDUCATION OF IRANIAN STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5731) to discharge a fiduciary obligation to Iran.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 8396, Calendar No. 2575.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has made a unanimous-consent request, has he not, to bring up the bill for immediate consideration?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; the disaster relief bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished Senator explain what is in the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8396) to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill was passed by the House on August

7, 1950. The Senate Committee on Public Works has favorably reported the bill, without amendment. I may say that we have before the Public Works Committee of the Senate some four or five bills on which we have held hearings, dealing with this problem. As I recall, 40 Senators were co-sponsors of one of those bills. However, this bill came from the House of Representatives, and it generally conforms to the judgment of the committee. Therefore, we reported the bill without amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the bill reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there a full attendance at the committee meeting of all members of the committee, on both sides, in order that all of them might have a chance to review the bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator refer to the time when the bill was reported by the committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At the time when the bill was discussed, that is generally

true. However, I cannot say that all members of the committee were there.

Mr. WHERRY. Were the minority members of the committee present at that time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator refer to the time when the bill was reported?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A majority of the committee have signed the report, I may say to the Senator, thus reporting the bill. I cannot testify from my own recollection as to what members of the committee were present at that time.

Mr. WHERRY. When the bill was discussed, before it was reported, was there attendance at the committee meeting of minority members of the committee? Does the Senator say there is no amendment to the bill, as reported?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no amendment to the bill, as reported, because the general consensus of opinion was that the bill conforms largely to the views of the members of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. There previously had been similar bills, as I understand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; and hearings had been held on them.

This bill provides authorization of an appropriation of \$5,000,000, to be spent at the direction of the President, to provide relief in major disasters. Major disasters are defined in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8396?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator to delay his request until some of us who have been interested in proposed legislation of this sort, which has been pending, including a fairly well-thought-out bill in which some 30 Senators have joined, may have an opportunity to consider this measure. I think there will be no objection, but I should like to have that opportunity afforded.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if there is going to be any delay or if any Senator desires to consider the bill further before having it considered by the Senate, I am perfectly willing to withdraw the request. However, I feel certain that we should act on the bill before the Congress adjourns, so that funds will be authorized for these purposes.

Mr. CORDON. I join the Senator in the hope that such a bill will be acted on. I have no desire to delay action on it, but I should like to have an opportunity to look over the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, then, I shall withdraw the request for the present.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Arkansas in expressing the hope that the bill will be acted on at this time. I believe it should be passed now.

There is a companion Senate bill which has the sponsorship of a large number of Senators.

I think the proposed legislation is sound, because if a disaster should occur, then this bill would provide the

means of assisting in alleviating and overcoming some of the resulting hardships, which might overtake any community.

We have had experience with similar disasters, in the case of the heavy snow storms in the Northwest and the floods in North Dakota and South Dakota last spring.

I believe the bill has been carefully thought out and has received considerable study, and it seems to me that such disaster situations would be alleviated by having the bill enacted. Therefore, I hope immediate action will be taken on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas withdraw his request?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe that the request which was made of the Senator from Arkansas was that he temporarily withhold his request for the present consideration of the bill, until other Senators have an opportunity to study the provisions of the bill.

I am not sure whether the Senator from Oregon has had time to do so yet; but I understand that he desires that the request for the present consideration of the bill be withheld for a moment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to have that done.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 450) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain authority of the Administrator, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1507. An act to amend section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946, relating to the receipt of pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, and for other purposes;

S. 2195. An act to authorize the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, to authorize the north side pumping division and related works, to provide for the disposition of reserved space in American Falls Reservoir, and for other purposes; and

S. 3504. An act to promote the development of improved transport aircraft by providing for the operation, testing, and modification thereof.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6862. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Wash.;

H. R. 7932. An act to amend section 2883 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 8821. An act authorizing payment to certain States amounts withheld from grazing fees on public lands;

H. R. 9399. An act to provide a more effective method of delivering applications for absentee ballots to servicemen and certain other persons; and

H. R. 9455. An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, as amended, so as to facilitate voting by members of the Armed Forces, and certain others, absent from their places of residence.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2317. An act relating to the construction of school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

S. 2822. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264);

H. R. 577. An act to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair;

H. R. 5101. An act to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation; and

H. R. 8847. An act to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

EDUCATION OF IRANIAN STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5731) to discharge a fiduciary obligation to Iran.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to explain House bill 5731, the pending measure. It should not take long to do so.

By way of introduction, I shall read the first paragraph of the committee report.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5731 (and an identical bill, S. 2342)) to discharge a fiduciary obligation to Iran, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment and unanimously recommend that the bill do pass.

Mr. President, the report from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to accompany this bill, reads in part as follows:

Having considered the same, report favorably and unanimously thereon, without amendment, and recommend that it do pass.

So both committees of the two Houses report unanimously on the identical bill, and recommend that it pass.

Mr. President, the background of the bill is rather interesting.

In 1924, Robert W. Imbrie, an American vice consul stationed at Tehran, the capital of then Persia, now Iran, was murdered by a mob. The case was settled to the satisfaction of both Governments by the compliance on the part of the Iranian Government with five demands which were made by the United States Government. Those demands consisted of an indemnity of \$60,000, fixed by this Government, for the benefit of the widow, Mrs. Imbrie; the rendering of full military honors to the body of Major Imbrie while on Iranian

soil; the punishment of the individual Iranians who were guilty of the crime; indemnity for another American who was injured at the same time; and the payment of \$110,000, calculated as the cost to the United States of dispatching the U. S. S. *Trenton* to Iran, to receive Major Imbrie's body and to return it to the United States for burial. It is this sum of \$110,000 which is the substance of the proposed legislation.

The subsequent negotiations with the Iranian Government are set forth in the exchange of notes between the two Governments. The notes have been published (Rept. 985 of the 69th Cong., 1st sess.), to accompany House Joint Resolution 154.

I may say that measure passed the House of Representatives prior to this time.

The first note, dated July 5, 1924, was delivered by the United States minister to the Iranian Prime Minister on July 6, 1924. After describing this Government's position in regard to the injury done, the note stated as follows:

My Government desires nothing which the facts of the case do not fully justify. It approaches the situation with no wish to offend a friendly Government or to require punitive damages. It is, however, insistent that full reparation should be made, that punishment should be meted out to the guilty, that assurances be given and enforced of adequate protection for the lives of American citizens, and that the safety of its officials in Persia should be guaranteed.

My Government—

In other words, the United States Government—

does not wish at this juncture to indicate in detail the particular steps which would be considered adequate to meet the situation resulting from the killing of Mr. Imbrie. The Persian Government has already stated on its own initiative that redress for the wife of the victim would be made. This redress should also extend to the covering of the expenses which might be incurred in connection with the dispatch to a Persian port of an American man-of-war to receive the body of Vice Consul Imbrie, which should be accompanied while on Persian soil by a suitable Persian military guard of honor and rendered appropriate honors at the time of leaving Persian territory. It is further considered that an appropriate guard should, if requested by the Legation, be furnished by the Persian Government both to the American Legation and to the American Consulate, such guard to be maintained pending the notification to the Persian Government that it is no longer considered necessary.

Mr. President, the next sentence is a very important passage:

My Government has further instructed me to reserve, for a later communication, further suggestions as to the action which may be considered necessary to meet the exigencies of the situation.

Mr. President, I emphasize that passage, because the point has been made by some persons that the opinion of the Comptroller General, to which I shall refer later, has great bearing on this matter. However, I call attention here to the fact that our own Government, when the demand was first made, instructed our official to reserve for a later communication further suggestions as to the action which might be considered necessary to meet the exigencies of the situation.

I read further:

I am instructed by my Government to add that the character of any additional statement which might be made to the Persian Government would be materially influenced by the action which that government may immediately take on its own initiative to make such further redress as may be appropriate, particularly in punishing those responsible for the crime and in giving full publicity to the action taken.

That is the end of the first communication.

The reply of the Iranian Government, on July 29, 1924, with respect to this item, is stated in the following terms:

Considering the official status of Mr. Imbrie, the deceased, the Persian Government agrees with the suggestion of the United States Government that the body of Mr. Imbrie be accorded honors during the transportation. The Persian Government is concerned over this matter to such an extent that it would ship the remains of the deceased consul to America aboard a Persian man-of-war if Persia possessed one. But inasmuch as it is unable to do so, it agrees to pay the expenses which may be incurred by the dispatch of an American man-of-war to receive the remains.

After the Iranian Government had carried out its other commitments, and after the Navy had arranged to send the U. S. S. *Trenton* to Iran, the American Chargé d'Affaires on November 9, 1924, delivered a note to the Iranian Government. In that note after acknowledging gratification at the Iranian Government's compliance, the following is stated—

Mr. President, may there be order in the Senate Chamber? The exchange of notes, which I am reading, is the whole crux of the matter; and if Senators understand these notes, I think the rest of the matter is very simple.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is the reply, on November 9, 1924, following the other exchange of notes:

One question which is now outstanding between the two governments with respect to the late incident is that of the reimbursement for the expenses incurred in dispatching an American man-of-war to Persia for the return of the vice consul's remains, expenses which the Persian Government in its note of July 29 has already expressed its willingness to meet. It is anticipated that this sum will approximate \$110,000.

My Government—

That is, the United States—

desires to effect a settlement of this question in a manner that will tend to promote the friendly relations between the two countries. It has, therefore, authorized me to propose that the Persian Government's undertaking in this matter be carried out by the establishment of a trust fund to be utilized for the education of Persian students at institutions of higher learning in the United States.

That was a voluntary note of the Government of the United States to the Iranian Government, on November 9, 1924. It will be noticed that in the beginning it says, "One question which is now outstanding * * *." So it is upon the basis of that note that I believe, and both committees believe, that there was intended to be established a trust of the

\$110,000 for the purpose set forth in that note. I continue to read from the note of our Government:

Upon receipt of information that the Persian Government is prepared to carry out this suggestion the precise arrangements which could best be made to give effect thereto can easily be determined. My Government believes that the Persian Government will be in full agreement with its view that the plan suggested will result in promoting a closer relationship and a better understanding between the peoples of the two countries.

To this the Iranian Government replied by a note of November 15, 1924:

I beg to advise that I have received your note, No. 49 of November 9, 1924, and that I have taken note of its contents. With regard to the payment of \$110,000, as the expenses incurred by the dispatch of the American vessel that carried the remains of Mr. Imbrie, instructions have been sent to the Ministry of Finance to the effect that they pay the money in any manner that is feasible.

I also beg to state that the proposal of the authorities of the great Government of the United States of America that this sum be spent on the sending of Persian students to the United States is appreciated by the authorities of the Imperial Government. In expressing my thanks for this evidence of the good will of the American Government, I avail myself of this opportunity—

And so forth. The exchange of notes was released to the press by the Department at the time.

The trust agreement, represented by the exchange of notes referred to in the preceding correspondence, became effective November 15, 1924. Every payment made thereafter was made on the basis of this trust. The first payment by the Iranian Government on the \$110,000 obligation was not made until December 24, 1924, subsequent to this exchange of notes. By that date this Government and the Iranian Government had already agreed that the money to be paid was to be charged with a trust for the education of Iranian students in the United States.

I do not know what could be clearer than that description of what had actually taken place and the understanding of our own Government.

As each of the four payments, in the form of bank drafts, was received it was kept intact in the Department of State. No draft was deposited in the Treasury until June 24, 1925. On February 19, 1925, the President sent a communication to Congress, together with a letter from the Secretary of State, requesting authorization action by Congress. In those communications they refer to the \$110,000 as a fund. Authorization legislation passed one House but was not reached by the other before adjournment. The four drafts, under circumstances which the record does not indicate with adequate clarity, were deposited in the Treasury on June 24, 1925. On January 6, 1926, the President and the Secretary of State wrote again, to the new Congress, requesting the same action which had been requested in the preceding year. In that communication, made after the deposit in the Treasury, President Coolidge and Secretary of State Hughes asked for action by Congress "in order that the funds in question may not lie idle during the coming year."

The Congress failed to act on the requests. For various reasons no action was taken or requested by the Department of State with respect to the further execution of this trust, nor by the Iranian Government, until 1947. Congress, however, disposed of a new claim of the widow of Vice Consul Imbrie by rejecting her request for a portion of the trust fund and enacting instead a private relief act by which she was paid "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" the sum of \$30,000 as additional compensation to that already provided by the Iranian Government to her, which, as I mentioned before, was \$60,000, so that she would receive a total of \$90,000.

The act, approved March 4, 1927 (ch. 526, 69th Cong., 2d sess., 44 Stat., pt. III, 1973), contained the following provision:

The acceptance of this sum by Katherine Imbrie shall be in full settlement of all claims or demands for personal injuries suffered by her and for the death of her husband.

The \$110,000 fund itself thus remained untouched.

The diplomatic and political history of the intervening period provides the chief reasons why the execution of the trust was not sought, and these reasons need not be expatiated upon. The Iranian Government has now called upon this Government to perform the trust, and the Department of State is ready and willing to do so. There can be no question that such performance would, particularly at this time, be in the best interests of both Governments.

When the drafts received from the Iranian Government, charged with the trust referred to, were deposited in the Treasury a countervailing entry should have been made setting the fund up as a trust fund. The failure to do this, irrespective of whose fault or oversight that was, cannot change the equitable nature of the obligation of the United States Government, nor remove the fiduciary character of the fund. It constituted a trust res in intention, and under the elementary rules of equity it remained and still remains a segregable trust res in the Treasury of the United States. The fact is the fund has always been considered as intact in the Treasury whenever the question has arisen and must be considered as intact now.

It is the view of the Department of State that \$110,000 of the general fund of the Treasury must therefore be considered impressed with a fiduciary obligation to constitute a segregable fund which as a trust res can be traced under the usual rules governing the tracing of assets.

No action has even been taken by Congress or by the Executive which deliberately or intentionally misappropriated the \$110,000 fund or announced the intention of this Government to repudiate the obligation into which the Secretary of State on the authority of the President entered with the Iranian Government to devote this fund for the education of Iranian students in the United States.

Nor is it material that the President in 1925 and 1926 asked for congressional action. While the motivation for that

request may not be entirely clear, the purpose was the execution of the trust and the request may very well have been founded on the absence of precedent in 1925 for the operation of a long-term student exchange program and, perhaps, on the thought that a greater demonstration of good will toward the Iranian Government and the Iranian people would be evidenced by the message of the President to the Congress and the authorization by the Congress to execute the trust. In any event, since the enactment of the Fulbright Act—Sixtieth Statute page seven hundred and fifty-four—and the Smith-Mundt Act—Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress—no such authorization by Congress should be necessary—the authority is adequate. Furthermore, the situation today falls squarely within the system of the act of February 27, 1896, since it is proposed to distribute the \$110,000 to a few "ascertained beneficiaries" who will be evident and in being when the certificates to the Secretary of the Treasury provided by the act of 1896 are signed by the Secretary of State. That was not the fact when the Congressional authorization was sought. Being a trust fund, no further authorization or act of appropriation is legally necessary by the Department. That is why the question was finally presented to the Comptroller General.

The Comptroller General, in his decisions, volume 27, page 641, held that there was not a legal trust, and he held that there should be a direction by Congress. He did not express any opinion about whether it was a proper purpose or a proper thing for the Congress to do, but he held that a direction would be required by him before he would consent to an expenditure of the fund in question by the Secretary of the Treasury. That is why we finally have this bill before us again, for the third time.

I should like to read one very short excerpt from the opinion of the Comptroller General, in order to make clear the very narrow ground upon which he held there was no legal trust. His theory is that, by the first note I read, the Iranian Government accepted the obligation to pay the \$110,000, and that therefore the subsequent note, which was the proposal by our Government—and, as will be recalled, our own Government, in the first instance, made the proposal to use this money as a trust for the education of Persian students was simply a gratuitous act, and that the right of the United States to the money had already vested as a matter of law. On page 645, he says:

Consequently, the subsequent offer on the part of this Government through the Secretary of State to use the sum of \$110,000 for the education of Persian students must be regarded as a purely gratuitous gesture entirely devoid of binding or obligating characteristics.

I submit that if we are to apply strictly private laws of trust to this kind of situation, in which our own Government has stated very clearly in the note that there was outstanding this question, which was not settled, and proposed that this money be used for this purpose, our Government in many cases will be found

wanting in good faith, because it is not the usual basis upon which we conduct our international relations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Had the money been paid into our Treasury when our Government made its offer?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It had not been paid. I want to stress that point.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood the Senator to so state and I wanted to have it clearly shown for the Record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely. I will review that situation. I know it is a little difficult to understand. The first note of July 26, 1924, was the demand for these five different things. Then the reply of the Iranian Government on July 29 was a very gracious acceptance of these demands. They wanted to do whatever was proper. I wish the Senator would note this fact. On November 9, 1924, the note said:

The only question which is now outstanding—

This is our note—

between the two governments is—

Indicating that the question had not been settled—

is the question of reimbursement. It has, therefore, authorized me to propose that the Persian Government's undertaking in this matter be carried out by the establishment of a trust fund to be utilized for the education of Persian students at institutions of higher learning in the United States.

No money had been paid at that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat, there is no question in the Senator's mind that the so-called trust agreement had been perfected between the two governments before the money was paid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. None whatever, before the money was paid. The first check or draft for money was received on December 24, which was more than a month after the note which proposed it be paid. The solicitor of the Department of State under President Coolidge in a memorandum used this language: "The same is being paid by the Persian Government following and presumably in reliance upon assurance given by the Secretary through the chargé d'affairs." I hope the Senator will follow this language. It is the language of the solicitor of the Department of State. The memorandum was written immediately after the pact. This was in 1925. It was immediately after the first draft had been paid. It was paid by four different drafts in the course of a few months.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the first bill which was introduced with respect to this matter, on January 9, 1926, by Representative Porter, in the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, provided an authorization for an appropriation, but had none of the provisions contained in the pending bill; and is it not a fact that that bill was not enacted into law?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That bill, if I recall, was the one that passed the House.

It came to the Senate 2 days before we recessed, and it did not pass the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was not enacted into law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. This bill does contain an authorization for an appropriation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The present bill goes much further than that, and does authorize an appropriation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the question I am about to ask the Senator from Arkansas. Is it not a fact that another bill was introduced later, a year or two afterward, and that bill also failed of enactment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is correct, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the Comptroller General in his report of April 16, 1948, in which he discussed this very point, stated in a memorandum addressed to the Secretary of State as follows:

If the State Department itself viewed the funds as impressed with a trust upon their receipt, it is not apparent why some request for an accounting adjustment has not been made over the past 23 years.

Is that statement not in the report of the Comptroller General?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the full report before me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hand the report to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see that it is particularly relevant, or what the significance of it is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The significance of it is that 23 years after the Congress of the United States had declined to act, this whole matter was forgotten by the State Department, and it was not until this recent revival in 1948 that the matter has been brought before Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's theory that if one undertakes a fiduciary obligation simply by forgetting it the obligation is discharged? It never occurred to me that is sound procedure as to an individual, and certainly not as to a government. It was our duty all that time to do this. I will say to the Senator that I was brought into it as the most junior member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Apparently no one else wanted to bother with it because it is such a relatively small amount. The widow of Mr. Imbrie has gone from one Member of Congress to another and persuaded them this is a dastardly thing.

I think it is purely a matter of principle. It ought to be done. I have about come to the conclusion that it is impossible to induce our Government to take action on a matter so small as this. If it involved \$10,000,000 it would long since have been disposed of. That is the real explanation, I think. It is so small that it gets lost in recesses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). If the present occupant of the chair may be pardoned for participating in the debate, the Senator stated a moment ago that the Government of Iran had asked that this

matter be reopened. What is the date of that request?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In 1947, I believe, the State Department said the Iranian Government had raised the question then, and I think it is true that in the intervening period it was forgotten, but I never assumed that was a discharge of a fiduciary obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not think so either.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Arkansas has read from the report of the Comptroller General. I think he has correctly described that report. It is a formal statement by the Comptroller General that in his opinion these funds were not impressed with a fiduciary aspect. Is that not correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wanted that to be clear in the record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is clear. I did not want to mislead the Senator. I think I read sufficiently from the report to establish that fact.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator did. However, frequently Senators are asked questions by other Senators in the course of a presentation, and I merely wanted to make it clear, by reason of the question asked by the Senator from Louisiana, that the Comptroller General of the United States as late as the 16th of April 1948, formally reported to the State Department that in his opinion this sum was not impressed with a trust.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to make very clear the grounds upon which he held that, and what the situation was. I read to the Senate the exact language of the notes which were exchanged. I think the Comptroller General is incorrect. He said the Iranian Government had clearly committed itself to pay whatever the expenses turned out to be. He said that is what they committed themselves to do in the original note. However, as I read our Government's subsequent note it clearly said that this was an outstanding matter. In other words, it was not settled, and we proposed to settle it in this way by the establishment of a trust. The Comptroller General says:

Consequently, the subsequent offer on the part of this Government through the Secretary of State, to use the sum of \$110,000 for the education of Persian students must be regarded as purely a gratuitous gesture, entirely devoid of binding or obligatory characteristics.

I do not agree with that. The Persian Government had not paid a cent. Let us assume that we had not made this offer, and they had said, "We do not know whether we will pay." We know of many cases where governments have not paid. It is not a foregone conclusion that they were going to pay. Our own Government admits that it is an outstanding matter as to how much they ought to pay with regard to the transfer of the body of Mr. Imbrie. The Persian Government never indicated that they were going to default, or anything else. They were in very friendly relations with us. Our Government said, "We propose you pay \$110,000, and we will use the money for this purpose."

If that is not clearly undertaking a fiduciary relationship, I do not know how to describe it. Our own Government uses the word in its own note, I say to the Senator from Georgia. This is the language, and this was used before any money was paid. This is our own Chargé talking.

It has therefore authorized me to propose that the Persian Government's undertaking in this matter be carried out by the establishment of a trust fund to be utilized for the education of Persian students at institutions of higher learning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield to the Chair for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Since this money was paid by the Iranian Government for the purpose of educating some of its youth, could not the trust fund have been established by the State Department, without an act of Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It could have been. There is no explanation why they did not credit it in the Treasury to a special trust fund, as was authorized under the act of 1896, which I mentioned a moment ago. I think that was an oversight. There is nothing to indicate there was any intention to do that, but it was credited to miscellaneous receipts. That is a technicality upon which the Comptroller General also partly bases his opinion. It should have been and could have been credited as a trust fund under the authority of the act of 1896.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Since the money was being paid under those conditions, would it not have been proper?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it was proper, and I think the Department was under the impression that had been done. At least they acted as if it had been in the first instance, and then they discovered that it had not been properly credited. I stated that the Department of State said that they thought it should have been credited as a trust fund under the authority of the act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that Maj. Sherman Miles was sent to Tehran in 1924 by the State Department to supervise the action of the Iran Government in carrying out its obligations with respect to the agreement, and is it not a fact that he reported to the State Department that no one was ever punished for this crime, that as a matter of fact, the chief of police, whose duty it was to preserve order in the city at the time, was later promoted to be military governor of Tehran, and may not that be the explanation why the State Department has so long forgotten this matter?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I would not say there is convincing evidence that that is a fact. I know that the widow of Mr. Imbrie has complained from time to time in her efforts to obtain this fund; and I may say, to be frank about it, that Mrs. Imbrie has persisted in her efforts to get this \$110,000 in addition to the

\$90,000 which she has already received. In my opinion, that is the sole reason why this case has not been settled in the past.

I have seen letters in the files in the committee. I do not remember so much the statements of Mr. Miles as I do some statements by Mr. Wallace Murray, who I believe was the chargé, or some official in the Embassy at Tehran.

There was a difference of opinion, particularly between Mr. Murray and Mrs. Imbrie. Mrs. Imbrie did not think the proper salute was fired when the ship carrying the body of her husband took off at Basra; that there should have been 21 guns fired at a particular time, but there were only 10. There were many things she thought were wrong with the honors paid to Mr. Imbrie. She also complained that the people who were responsible for the act were not punished.

From what I gathered from reading the files, Mr. Imbrie's death was caused by a mob, and it is rather difficult to say who is responsible when there is a mob. I think Mrs. Imbrie thought the chief of police should have borne the responsibility and should have been hanged at the moment. I cannot pass on all the details as to who was punished, and how. That is a matter of controversy. That is why I am not willing to say what the facts were. I can only say that there is some difference of opinion as to whether proper honors were paid on the shipment of the body of Mr. Imbrie on the *Trenton*, and whether the guilty persons were punished. But that is not the controversy here.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a brief statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Inasmuch as the Senator has seen fit to make certain comments with respect to the widow of the American vice consul who was assassinated in the performance of his duties in the capital of a foreign government, I should like to say that I have known Mrs. Imbrie for more than 20 years. While I have been a Member of the Senate I have known her, and never once has she even suggested to me that she desired to have any part of this money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say to the Senator—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator's statement of depreciation with respect to the widow of an American official has really no part in this argument.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will pay close attention, in the first place, I do not consider that what I have said was depreciation. I am trying to state a fact, that Mrs. Imbrie has attempted to obtain this fund.

I have in my hand a letter dated August 2, 1949, which was subsequent to the introduction of the original bill. This letter is addressed to Hon. TOM CONNALLY, chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington 25.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: There are two bills which will come to your committee for final action; H. R. 3731 has passed House; Senate bill 2342, introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT, is still pending.

I need not read it all. I will do so, if the Senator from Wyoming desires to have me. But the last paragraph reads:

Now it is my request that I be given a hearing and present my claim for the Trenton Fund.

Your office can reach me at Metropolitan 4094.

With assurances of my appreciation, I am,
Sincerely yours,

KATHERINE IMBRIE.

That is her signature, and under it is "Mrs. Robert Whitney Imbrie, relict."

I do not know what could be plainer than that she is here stating to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in 1949, that she wants to present her claim to this fund. If I have misinterpreted that, I apologize to Mrs. Imbrie, but I thought I was justified in saying she was seeking this fund.

I brought this letter along simply as one piece of evidence. I believe the Senator will find in the files that there are several letters, in fact, an enormous file in this matter, in one of which Mrs. Imbrie includes a great many excerpts from official documents pertaining to the matter of the shipment of the body of her husband at the port, how many shots had been fired, and whether or not due deference had been paid to the body of her husband.

I certainly do not want to reflect upon Mrs. Imbrie as an individual. I am sure she takes this very seriously. But, on the other hand, I believe our Government has an obligation. While it is true the amount is small, it is a solemn obligation undertaken by this Government for a worthy purpose, namely, to create conditions in which riots will not continue to be stirred up in one country or another, and to try to bring about, as the department says, better relations between the two countries.

If we followed the rule of an eye for an eye or a tooth for a tooth, we would never make any progress. I think this whole thing is a gesture of good will. The amount is small. I think it is indefensible to say that we do not have any obligation to discharge this undertaking, and to do everything our Government undertook to do. We were under no pressure to say we would use this fund for this purpose. We did it voluntarily, and the Iranian Government, as Mr. Hyde has said, in reliance upon our action, paid the money. I think Mrs. Imbrie is unduly excited about the details.

In all fairness, I am sure that the payment which was made, which I think was \$90,000, compared with what we give on death claims in other fields, was adequate. We have never given that much where our own Government has caused a death. I believe in one case last year, at the insistence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], we allowed \$25,000, but before that \$10,000 had been the top.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I am interested in section 2 of the bill, which begins with this language:

The said sum of \$110,000 shall be deemed a trust fund received by the Secretary of

State under the provisions of the act of February 27, 1896 (29 Stat. 32, title 31, U. S. C., sec. 547).

Can the Senator advise me as to what the provisions of the act referred to are? I am particularly interested in whether or not the act provides for the payment of interest on trust funds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My curbstone opinion would be that the act does not provide for interest. It is title 31, United States Code, and reads:

All moneys received by the Secretary of State from foreign governments and other sources, in trust for citizens of the United States or others, shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury.

The Secretary of State shall determine the amounts due claimants, respectively, from each of such trust funds, and certify the same to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall, upon the presentation of the certificates of the Secretary of State, pay the amounts so found to be due.

That is the language of the act.

Mr. CORDON. Is that the entire section?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. Prior to the Comptroller General's opinion, I believe the State Department thought this did constitute a trust under that provision.

Mr. CORDON. My next question, then, is, What is the reason for the language in the next sentence, with particular reference to this portion of it, quoting from line 12, page 2, "which fund shall be deemed, insofar as the same may be necessary, to have been heretofore appropriated as a trust fund under the said act of February 27, 1896, and the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, as amended," and so forth.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The theory has been to preserve the relationship which it was thought had been established by the exchange of notes that this is a trust fund paid by the Iranians for this purpose. It is felt that as a matter of public relations the theory of its being a trust fund should be preserved, rather than that it is a gratuitous appropriation of our own funds for that purpose.

Mr. CORDON. Is it intended by that language to cure, by retroactive application, whatever error the Secretary of State may have made when he deposited the funds to the general account of the Treasury?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I think is the purpose sought to be achieved.

Mr. CORDON. Is any accrued interest credited to this account?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my information that there is not, although I think a case could be made for it, because it was by our default that the money was never used for the purpose. However, I am not proposing such a thing. The bill does not provide for it, and I know of no one who contemplates any interest. I do not think anyone entertains a doubt that no interest is to be considered, unless we should provide that it shall be paid, and I am not asking that that be done.

Mr. CORDON. Is the Senator asking by reference to any of the sections of the law, that the bill make provision for interest?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; and the mention I made of the law of 1896 is not with the thought that interest should be paid on these funds.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my definite understanding that if the bill is passed, no interest will be added to the fund. It will simply provide for the amount of \$110,000 which the Iranian Government deposited with our Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Wyoming does not feel that my remarks have in any way been personal or reflected upon the widow of Mr. Imbrie. That is not my purpose. I think he can understand that this is a matter with which I have been struggling. It is one of those rather small matters that require an enormous amount of time. I must say that I have spent a good deal of time on it. Last year I tried to get the bill through the Senate, and it was held up on the call of the calendar.

The question has been asked, "Why did not the bill pass the Congress?" The Senator knows that it is extremely difficult to induce the leadership ever to find time for a bill of this small consequence; therefore if it is not passed on the call of the calendar it simply is not passed. That is what has happened to this bill. I do not think the fact that it has not been passed indicates in the slightest any lack of merit in the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to read one short paragraph from the House report. I think it sort of sums up what was the unanimous view of that committee. It is as follows:

In the committee's view, the proposition of this bill is not simply the proposition that the United States should honor its pledged word as the only course compatible with its dignity. It involves also the proposition that the United States shall manifest helpfulness toward a friendly people by providing education in American techniques to nationals who, upon completion of their studies, will be able to serve usefully in their homeland. This bill is completely in keeping with the actions taken by Congress in Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 584, Seventy-ninth Congress—which represents policies in the interest both of this country and of its friends.

So I think there is every reason why under the present circumstances the Senate should pass the bill and dispose of this obligation which has been hanging over our heads for a quarter of a century.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair.) The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that there are now six Members present on the floor of the Senate. That is an illustration of how sometimes bills which should not be passed are passed. Therefore, Mr. President, before I take the floor to explain some of the reasons why I have during this session objected to the passage of the bill on the call of the calendar, I must suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hoey	Martin
Benton	Holland	Millikin
Butler	Humphrey	Morse
Byrd	Hunt	Mundt
Cain	Ives	Murray
Chapman	Jenner	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Darby	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kem	Saltonstall
Dworschak	Kerr	Schoeppel
Eaton	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Langer	Stennis
Ferguson	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	Lehman	Thye
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	McCarran	Tydings
Gillette	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Young
Hill	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). A quorum is present. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the pending bill was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, through the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. The bill is entitled "A bill to discharge a fiduciary obligation to Iran."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to try to have the Senate pass at this time the small bill to which I have previously referred?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Arkansas appreciates the fact that when the absence of a quorum was suggested, there were only six Senators on the floor. Therefore, I desire to make at this time a brief statement in regard to the reasons why, in my opinion, this bill relating to Iran should not pass. If the Senator from Arkansas will bear with me, I think it would be well to postpone his request.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this entire matter arises out of the mysterious assassination of the American Vice Consul at Tehran as long ago as 1924. That diplomatic representative of the United States Government, Maj. Robert Imbrie, had served the Government of the United States with great distinction. He was our representative at Ankara at the time when great changes of social and political relationships among the people of Turkey were occurring. He was credited with having contributed very largely to the westernization of Turkey and the establishment of a much more democratic attitude among the people of Turkey. He was sent by the Government of the United States to Petrograd; in fact, he was the last representative the United States had at Petrograd, until the Soviet Government was recognized later.

He was a friend of the Finns, and he had made a great struggle to be of aid and assistance to them.

He went to Tehran; and there is every reason to believe that he was assassinated in Tehran in a riot which was caused by the Bolsheviks, whom he had offended by his actions as a representative of the United States.

Last evening, immediately before the Senate adjourned, I read into the Record the testimony of another diplomatic representative of the United States, Mr. Edgar Sisson, who was in Russia during the Red Revolution. He was sent there by President Woodrow Wilson. He published a book entitled, "One Hundred Red Days." In this book there is to be found the following reference to Major Imbrie:

Intelligence channel, however, between Russia and the United States was not closed. Robert Imbrie, sent by Ambassador Francis from Vologda to be acting consul at Petrograd after the Brest-Litovsk peace reopened the city, became the active intelligence officer, and continued in that capacity after Americans left Russia, going then to the border city of Viborg, in Finland. His work, so far as I know, never has received public credit, and certainly not its deserts. Nor have I felt that his death, in Tehran, July 18, 1924, was free from mystery. He was killed, supposedly by accidental violence, in a street riot which suddenly flared up around him without understood cause. Tehran at that time was a center for a Bolshevik group plotting Asiatic turmoil. The Persian Government, because the death was in its territory, paid indemnity to Imbrie's widow and the international episode was officially closed.

Mr. Sisson then said:

I was protected from the Bolsheviks by the publication of my report. To have harmed me afterward would have been a silly form of confession. Imbrie, however, never had that protection. He remained on distant service.

Mr. President, after the death of Major Imbrie, diplomatic representations were made to the Government of Persia, as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out this morning in presenting the case for the consideration of the Senate. The first note, which was sent about a week after the death of Mr. Imbrie, contained this paragraph:

My Government has further instructed me to reserve, for a later communication, further suggestions as to the action which might be considered necessary to meet the exigencies of the situation. I am instructed by my Government to add that the character of any additional statement which might be made to the Persian Government would be materially influenced by the action which that Government may immediately take on its own initiative to make such further redress be appropriate, particularly in punishing those responsible for the crime and in giving full publicity to the action taken.

There is no record that anyone was ever punished for that crime. There is no record that publicity was ever given by the Imperial Government of Persia with respect to the efforts which might have been made with respect to an attempt to find out who was responsible and why the crime was committed. But we have the testimony of Mr. Sisson, also a servant of the United States in the diplomatic service, that he was protected from the Bolsheviks, but Imbrie was not, and that the assassination, supposedly taking place in an accidental uprising of a violent street riot, was always to him a mystery. It remains a mystery, Mr. President.

After the death of Major Imbrie, and after the agreement to punish those who were responsible, the Government of the United States sent a representative to

Tehran, to see what was done. Major Sherman Miles, another distinguished American, was the man who was dispatched to Tehran in 1924 to supervise the reparations that were made. He reported to the Department of State, on August 13, 1924, that no one was accused or punished, and that the chief of police was not even reprimanded; indeed, Mr. President, within a year he was promoted to be the head of the military district of Tehran.

It has seemed to me, and no one challenges these facts, that in these circumstances the very last thing we should do would be to take this sum of \$110,000, which was paid by the Government of Persia to the United States to reimburse the United States for the expense of sending the U. S. S. *Trenton* across the Atlantic and through the Mediterranean down into Persia, to bring the body of the American diplomatic representative back to the United States—I say, in the absence of any proof or showing that anyone was punished, in the face of the clear charge that the Bolsheviks were responsible, and that charge emanating from the State Department itself, it seems to me impossible to conceive that we should take that money and seek now to impress it with a trust for the education of foreign students.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator to pardon me for a moment. I have no objection whatever to the education of students, and I helped the Senator from Arkansas during the Seventy-ninth Congress to secure passage of the bill whereby the funds received by the United States from the sale of surplus property abroad should be used for the education of students. It is my information that, under that program—which properly bears the name of the Senator from Arkansas and is called the Fulbright program—under the program for the exchange of foreign students in 1951, when the foreign agreements are made, there will be some \$67,000,000 in foreign currencies available for education. It is true that this money is in foreign currencies. But the Congress of the United States has been disposed to make some appropriations for the education of students. What I am objecting to is the use for this purpose of this particular money which was paid into the Treasury of the United States and credited to miscellaneous funds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I want to say that certainly the Senator from Wyoming was very instrumental in having passed the legislation to which he referred. As I recall, he was chairman of the subcommittee which considered it. I appreciate the reference to it. But I think it has nothing whatever to do with this bill. With regard to the report of Major Miles, which was made, I believe, as the Senator stated, in the summer of 1924, subsequent to that time our Government made the proposal, our own State Department made the proposal that this fund of \$110,000 be used for this

purpose. I am not trying to justify this bill on the ground that it should permit the exchange of students or the sending of students, at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that fully.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is upon the very simple ground that we made this proposal, we undertook to set up a trust fund, and, subsequent to that offer, the money was received. It is simply a fiduciary obligation, a trust obligation, which we ought to discharge regardless of the merits.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my position simply is that, in the absence of any proof that anyone was punished, in the presence of a declaration by the representative of the United States who went to Tehran to see what was done, that in fact no one was even accused, I say that no trust has ever arisen, and it should not be permitted to arise.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Senator is arguing with the Government's having made the proposal. That is an entirely different approach. The fact is that the Government, knowing what the Senator says, made the proposal; it was accepted; and now he says, as I understand, "Well, it should not have made any such proposal, since all those in control of the situation had not been punished."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not follow that at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am aware of the fact that President Coolidge sent to Congress a bill proposing that this money be used for this purpose. I am aware of the fact that two bills were introduced in the twenties, in 1926 and, perhaps, in 1928, but neither of these bills was ever enacted.

When the present effort was made to impress this money with a trust the matter was referred to the Comptroller General, and he himself in his report made the response that in his opinion no trust had arisen as a result of these exchanges. I read from page 9 of the report of the Comptroller General of the United States dated April 16, 1948. It is a letter addressed to the Secretary of State:

If the State Department itself viewed the funds as impressed with a trust upon their receipt, it is not apparent why some request for an accounting adjustment has not been made over the past 23 years. The existence of political or other factors rendering the performance of the trust inadvisable does not explain the delay.

It was suggested, Mr. President, by the State Department, as clearly implied in these words, that the delay for more than 23 years was based upon some political or other factors. Whatever may be the truth about that, I say that the conditions which exist at the present time render it highly inappropriate that the money reparations paid for the death of an American diplomatic representative at the hands of Bolshevik rioters should be handled in the manner proposed here.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator wish to hold the present Iranian Government responsible?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. However, other diplomatic representatives of the United States have been held by Bolsheviks. Americans have been imprisoned in China. Americans have been imprisoned in satellite countries. We received no consideration at the hands of those satellite countries. I say this is no time for us to take the action proposed by the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator regard Iran as a satellite country?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; of course not. However, I am saying that when an American has been assassinated by Bolsheviks and no punishment has been meted out, certainly the last thing we should do is to take this particular money and use it for this purpose. Let the Senator introduce a bill for an appropriation under the ECA Act or any of the other authorizations but let us not take this reparation fund when there is no proof that any punishment was ever inflicted upon those who were guilty.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. Is there anything in the record on either side of the question as to any affirmative proof that the Persian Government failed to take steps to effect punishment? I do not understand whether steps were taken. I can understand that if steps were taken the result might not be punishment for anyone, because there must be identification and proper proof. Is the record silent on the whole question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cite only the fact, as I understand, that an American diplomatic representative, Maj. Sherman Miles, who went to Tehran in 1924 did in fact report to the State Department that no one was even accused of the crime, let alone punished for it, and that there was no publication, as required by the demand of the United States. That is the record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator has overstated that point. I have before me a copy of the memorandum signed by Maj. Sherman Miles, who went into this matter very thoroughly. I should like to read some of his remarks. There is a difference of opinion on the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Difference of opinion about what?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Whether or not there was any effort made to bring to justice the persons who were guilty. The position of the widow of Mr. Imbrie is primary that the head man, that is, the man in charge of the Army, should have been punished. This memorandum clearly indicates that someone was punished. It says:

Far from denying the complicity of the Army in the crime, which the Chief of Staff had denied, the Military Governor repeatedly emphasized his desire to bring to justice all guilty officers and men, and he said

he considered the officer of the guard of the Pehlevi Regiment on July 18 guilty of neglect of duty.

The Military Governor stated that the execution of more than one man for the murder of one man was forbidden by Sheriat law; but, nevertheless, to show respect to the American Government and to prevent the occurrence of such a crime, three men had been condemned to death. He intimated that the Sheriat law could be avoided by sentencing some of the men, not for murder, but for disobedience of orders supposed to have been given them.

The military governor's remarks were almost wholly directed towards convincing us that almost superhuman efforts had been made to secure justice, and that full justice had been or was on the point of being obtained. He was obviously perfectly satisfied with what had been done.

Apparently they thought America was going a little far in asking that more than one person be put to death for the killing of one man because that is forbidden by their law. However, I do not gather from these reports that nothing was done. Apparently our Government was not pleased that the military governor himself was not disciplined. That is what this file will reveal. It indicates that three men were condemned to death.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will recall that in the report of the House committee, from which he himself has quoted in his report, the statement was made that either side of the issue can be cogently stated: The argument which the Senator makes, that there was a trust fund, and the argument which the Comptroller General makes, that there was no trust fund. The fact remains that a great mystery has surrounded this case from the very beginning until the end, and the testimony given by Mr. Sisson in his book, published in 1931 by the Yale University Press, was to me convincing evidence that this is a matter which should receive a great deal more consideration than it has had up to date.

I therefore move that the bill be re-committed to committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that the bill (H. R. 5731) to discharge a fiduciary obligation to Iran, be re-committed to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Green	Long
Benton	Gurney	McCarran
Butler	Hendrickson	McClellan
Byrd	Hill	McFarland
Cain	Hoey	McKellar
Chapman	Holland	McMahon
Chavez	Humphrey	Magnuson
Connally	Hunt	Malone
Cordon	Ives	Martin
Darby	Jenner	Millikin
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Dworschak	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Eaton	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Ellender	Kefauver	Neely
Ferguson	Kerr	O'Connor
Frear	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Langer	Robertson
George	Leahy	Russell
Gillette	Lehman	Saltonstall
Graham		Schoeppel

Smith, Maine	Tobey	Wiley
Stennis	Tydings	Williams
Thomas, Okla.	Watkins	Young
Thye	Wherry	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not send the bill back to committee. The bill was not only passed by the House by a very large majority, but was reported to the Senate from the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously. The subcommittee which considered the bill prior to the action by the full committee also reported it to the committee unanimously. It seems to me that the money in question ought to be paid to Iran. The United States makes no claim to it. The widow has already received \$90,000. In the last bill which was passed giving her \$30,000 it was provided that it should be the last amount that would be paid. So I hope the Senate will dispose of the bill one way or the other and not leave it hanging in air.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely desire to say there is no question involved as to what the widow of this diplomat should or should not receive. Her claim has been paid in full to my knowledge, no additional claim for payment has been made by her. The sum involved is \$110,000 which was expended by the United States to bring the body of a diplomatic representative back to the United States. If the bill should be enacted the United States would be spending \$110,000 more because of the assassination of one of its diplomatic representatives.

I wish Senators could read the debate which took place in the Senate in 1924 when the same proposition was rejected. The Senate in 1924 did not lightly regard the obligations which the Government and the people of the United States owe in sustaining the hands of its diplomatic representatives abroad. I think the bill has not been sufficiently studied and should go back to the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and I confess that I am not acquainted with all the facts, but I listened with interest to my good friend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] when he discussed the bill. I believe the bill is a worthy one and should be passed in that it seeks to carry out an obligation which our Government owes to the Iranian Government. Judging from what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has stated—and the evidence is all documentary—the \$110,000 were paid over by the Iranian Government more or less on condition that that amount be used in order to establish a trust fund for the education of Iranian students. I believe that to be very plain. True the suggestion came from us but no payments were made until we agreed to establish the trust fund in question. The report from the Foreign Relations Committee shows that that was the purpose for which the money was to be used and much evidence was produced to sustain that view. Why the State Department did not establish the trust fund at the time the money was paid over is beyond me. It certainly had the right to do so under existing law.

As I understand the bill, and I repeat, its purpose is simply to carry out the agreement which was made back in 1924 between our State Department and the Government of Iran. I do not see any necessity for sending the bill back to the Foreign Relations Committee because all of the evidence is documentary and it was presented to the committee when the bill was up for consideration. Re-commitment would result in killing the bill. We have sufficient evidence before us to sustain the findings of the Foreign Relations Committee and I am hopeful that the bill will be finally passed as reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to re-commit the bill (H. R. 5731) to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5731) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1192. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;
 S. 1208. An act for the relief of Pasch Bros.;
 S. 1357. An act for the relief of Gregory Pirro and Nellie Pirro;
 S. 1501. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ray S. Berrum;
 S. 2324. An act for the relief of Maria Balsam;
 S. 2599. An act for the relief of Arturo Benetti;
 S. 2648. An act for the relief of Carlo Fava;
 S. 2835. An act for the relief of Boris Paul von Stuckenberg and wife, Maria Alexander von Stuckenberg;
 S. 2922. An act for the relief of Chieko Murata;
 S. 3015. An act for the relief of Walter Tyson;
 S. 3018. An act for the relief of W. F. Steiner;
 S. 3121. An act for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Planetto;
 S. 3306. An act for the relief of Dr. George Peter Petropoulos;
 S. 3307. An act for the relief of Colvin Bernard Meik;
 S. 3321. An act for the relief of Dr. Zena (Zenobia) Symeonides;
 S. 3431. An act for the relief of Tatiana Moravec;
 S. 3434. An act for the relief of Mikiko Anzai;
 S. 3579. An act for the relief of Midshipman Willis Howard Dukelow, United States Navy;
 S. 3727. An act to authorize certain construction at Griffiss Air Force Base, and for other purposes;
 S. 3796. An act to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the use of petroleum as fuel aboard steam vessels;
 S. 3807. An act to authorize the President to appoint Col. Henry A. Byroade as Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, Depart-

ment of State, without affecting his military status and perquisites;

S. 2814. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation;

S. 3824. An act for the relief of Kenneth Bruce Kohel Kozal; and

S. 3917. An act for the relief of Basilio Gorgone.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3995. An act for the relief of Annetta Bachis, Anna Bellani, Angelina Colombo, Maria Grazia Impari, Franca Porricino, and Antonia Tirabassi;

H. R. 5083. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Emelia (Anna Bohn);

H. R. 7390. An act for the relief of Erika Kuebart and her minor son;

H. R. 7631. An act for the relief of Ottavia De Gaspare and Sandra De Gaspare;

H. R. 8452. An act for the relief of Ronald Mow and Angeline Cecilia Mow;

H. R. 8718. An act for the relief of Fred Hess;

H. R. 8769. An act for the relief of Annmarie Stritter and her minor daughter; and

H. R. 9084. An act for the relief of Hifumi Kato and her minor son, Kazuyuki Kato.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5226) to amend paragraph 207 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4569) authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 102) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 19, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2317. An act relating to the construction of school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

S. 2822. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 6862. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Wash.; and

H. R. 8821. An act authorizing payment to certain States amounts withheld from grazing fees on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7932. An act to amend section 2883 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Finance.

AUTHORIZATION OF AGREEMENTS PROVIDING FOR UNION MEMBERSHIP AMONG RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, various Senators have asked me what the program is for today. There are sev-

eral privileged matters which will be taken up. Two of them are veto messages. One is a conference report. In order that there may be something before the Senate, however, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3295, Calendar No. 2263.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3295) to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deductions from the wages of carrier's employees for certain purposes and under certain conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make an inquiry?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Senate bill 3295 has been made the unfinished business. I now ask the Senator about the privileged matters he mentioned.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is about to move that the Senate take up the veto message of the President on House bill 6217, which he has a right to do.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Is it then the intention of the distinguished acting majority leader to bring up another veto message, and then the conference reports?

Mr. McFARLAND. Either the veto messages or the conference reports will be taken up first.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that a House amendment to a Senate bill may be laid before the Senate?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

PALISADES DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2195) to authorize the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, to authorize the north side pumping division and related works, to provide for the disposition of reserved space in American Falls Reservoir, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, Idaho, heretofore authorized under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws by the presentation to the President and the Congress of the report of December 9, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 457, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), by the Secretary of the Interior (herein called the Secretary), is hereby reauthorized under the Federal reclamation laws for construction and operation and maintenance substantially in accordance with that report as supplemented and modified by the Commissioner's supplemental report and the recommendations incorporated by reference therein, as approved and adopted by the Secretary on July 1, 1949, and as including, upon approval by the President of a

suitable plan therefor, facilities for the improvement of fish and wildlife along the headwaters of the Snake River, such facilities to be administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding recommendations to the contrary contained in said report (a) the Secretary shall reserve not to exceed 55,000 acre-feet of active capacity in Palisades Reservoir for a period ending December 31, 1952, for replacement of Grays Lake storage, but no facilities in connection with the proposed wildlife management area at Grays Lake shall be built and no allocation of construction costs of the Palisades Dam and Reservoir by reason of providing replacement storage to that area shall be made until the development and operation and maintenance of the wildlife management area has been authorized by act of Congress, and (b) the nonreimbursable allocation on account of recreation shall be limited to the costs of specific recreation facilities in an amount not to exceed \$148,000.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized for construction and operation and maintenance under the Federal reclamation laws: (a) the north side pumping division of the Minidoka project, this to be substantially in accordance with the Commissioner's report and the recommendations incorporated by reference therein, as approved and adopted by the Secretary on July 1, 1949: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding recommendation to the contrary contained in said report, (1) lease or sale of that portion of the power service system extending from the substations to the pumping plants may be made to any entity on terms and conditions that will permit the United States to continue to provide power and energy to the pumping facilities of the division, and, in the event of lease or sale to a body not entitled to preference in the purchase of power under the Federal reclamation laws, will preserve a reasonable opportunity for subsequent lease or sale to a body that is entitled to such privilege, (2) no allocation of construction costs of the division shall be made on a nonreimbursable basis by reason of wildlife benefits, and (3) there shall be, in lieu of a 40-year period, a basic repayment period of 50 years for repayment, in the manner provided in the recommendations of the irrigation costs assigned for repayment by the water users; and (b) for the furnishing of electric power for irrigation pumping to that division and for other purposes, power generating and related facilities at American Falls Dam. These generating and related facilities, to the extent the Secretary finds to be proper for pay-out and rate-making purposes, may be accounted for together with other power facilities operated by the Secretary that are interconnected with the American Falls Dam power facilities, excluding any power facilities the net profits of which are governed by subsection I of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 703).

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized to contract, under the Federal reclamation laws, with water users and water users' organizations as to the use for their benefit of the heretofore reserved storage capacity in American Falls Reservoir. Not to exceed 315,000 acre-feet of that capacity shall be made available to those who have heretofore had the use of reserved capacity under lease arrangements between the United States and the American Falls Reservoir district of Idaho, the distribution of this capacity among contractors to be determined by the Secretary after consultation with the interested water users' organizations or their representatives. Of the balance of the reserved capacity, 47,593 acre-feet are hereby set aside for use under contract for the benefit of the lands comprising unit A of the north side pumping division of the Minidoka project, and 71,000 acre-feet are hereby set aside for use under contract for the

benefit of those lands in the Michaud area which may hereafter be found to be feasible of development under irrigation. Contracts for the repayment of construction charges in connection with reserved capacity shall be made without regard to the second proviso of the tenth paragraph (Minidoka project, Idaho) under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation" of the act of June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 390, 417). Such contracts shall require the repayment of all costs determined by the Secretary to be allocable to the reserved capacity, less, in the case of the 315,000 acre-feet of capacity above described, three hundred and eighty-six four-hundred-and-thirty-fourths of the revenues realized, after deduction of what the Secretary determines to be an appropriate share for operation, maintenance, and replacements, from the leasing of that capacity for irrigation purposes up to the time water first becomes available in Palisades Reservoir and, in the case of the capacity set aside for the north side pumping division, all other revenues realized from or connected with the reserved capacity and which the Secretary determines to be available as a credit against the cost allocable to that division.

SEC. 4. (a) The continuation of construction of Palisades Dam beyond December 31, 1951, or such later controlling date fixed by the Secretary as herein provided, is hereby made contingent on there being a finding by the Secretary by the controlling date that contracts have been entered with various water users' organizations of the Upper Snake River Valley in Idaho that, in his opinion, will provide for an average annual savings of 135,000 acre-feet of winter water. If in the Secretary's judgment the failure of the requisite organizations so to contract by the controlling date at any time is for reasons beyond the control of those organizations, he may set a new controlling date but not beyond December 31, 1942.

(b) Repayment contracts made in connection with the use of capacity in either American Falls or Palisades Reservoir may include, among other things, such provisions as the Secretary determines to be proper to give effect to recommendations referred to in section 1 of this act, and particularly those concerning the continued effectiveness of the arrangements as to the minimum average annual water savings.

SEC. 5. This act is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws as these are defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187).

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sums of not to exceed \$76,601,000 for the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, Idaho, \$11,395,000 for the Minidoka project north side pumping division, Idaho, and \$6,600,000 for the American Falls power plant.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. ECTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO MEMBERS OF RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6319) to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and

lumber on the Red Lake Reservation, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6319) to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from the fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States arising from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber within the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota, according to the provisions of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to pay therefrom \$75, in two equal installments to each member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota who is living at the date of enactment of this act. The first installment of \$37.50 per capita to be made upon the passage and approval of this act and the second installment of \$37.50 per capita to be made January 15, 1951. Such installment payments shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

"SEC. 2. No money paid to Indians under this act shall be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other persons. Before any payment is made under this act, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota shall, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, ratify and accept the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 3. Payments made under this act and shall not be held to be 'other income and resources' as that term is used in sections 2 (a) (7), 402 (a) (7), and 1002 (a) (8) of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 42, secs. 302 (a) (7), 602 (a) (7), and 1202 (a) (8))."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
ERNEST W. McFARLAND,
HUGH BUTLER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
TOBY MORRIS,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator explain the conference report?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill as originally passed by the House of Representatives provided for a payment of \$100 per capita to the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota.

On the floor of the Senate, when the bill was reached during the call of the calendar, the bill was amended so as to provide for a \$75 payment, after the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had voted to reduce the payment to \$50.

The House bill provided that the payment should not come within the interpretation of certain social security laws, and the House insisted upon that provision. The Senate agreed to it. That is the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Does the conference report call for a payment of \$100 or a payment of \$75 per capita?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. \$75.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, that payment is to be made in two installments, as I understand, one of \$37.50 on the passage and approval of this measure and a second installment of \$37.50 on January 15, 1951.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Of course we regret that the Indians are not to be paid the full amount of \$100; but it is better to take three-fourths of a loaf than no loaf at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS BENEFITS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the reconsideration of House bill 6217, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. The bill was vetoed by the President, and subsequently was passed by the House of Representatives over the President's veto. The bill is entitled "A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will not suggest the absence of a quorum. As he knows, under the Constitution there will have to be a yea-and-nay vote on this question.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course. However, inasmuch as the Senator from Alabama is about to make a speech on this subject, I thought perhaps I should suggest the absence of a quorum. On the other hand, I observe that there is a fairly good attendance of Senators at this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I stated, the bill after being passed by the House and by the Senate was vetoed by the President.

It then was returned to the House, inasmuch as it was a House bill. The House, on reconsideration, by an over-

whelming vote of 321 to 12, overrode the veto.

The question now before the Senate is, Shall the bill pass, upon reconsideration, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The bill would provide for the giving of out-patient treatment to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including veterans of the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection. In order to obtain this treatment, their injuries would be deemed to be service-connected. As we know, under existing law, today all veterans who have a service-connected disability are entitled to such out-patient treatment. In fact, the veterans of World War I and World War II are entitled to a great deal more than that; they are entitled to in-patient treatment, which means that they are entitled to go to a hospital and have a bed there and be treated there and have hospitalization and medical care.

All that this bill would provide would be to give the benefit of out-patient treatment to the Spanish-American War veterans.

The bill was given careful consideration by both the House committee and the Senate committee. Two days of hearings were held by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, at which times officials of the Veterans' Administration, representatives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and representatives of the United Spanish War Veterans were heard. The hearings disclosed that the average Spanish-American War veteran today is 74 years of age, that these veterans are dying at the rate of approximately 9,000 a year, and that approximately 118,000 of them were living as of June 30 last. In fact, it is estimated that within the next 20 or 25 years, none of these veterans will be alive.

I think perhaps the best statement in behalf of the bill, certainly the best statement in behalf of passing the bill notwithstanding the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary, was made by a Spanish-American War veteran who is a Member of the House of Representatives. I refer to the gentleman from Illinois, Representative O'HARA. At this time I wish to quote from a statement made by him. I shall quote from his statement because as a Spanish-American War veteran, he testified in the House of Representatives from his own personal knowledge. In the House, he made a statement as to what he saw with his own eyes and what he personally experienced, and the conditions under which our soldiers in the Spanish-American War served and suffered. He stated:

In the present instance I feel that the President has been misinformed. It is not within the range of human limitations for any man vested with the great responsibility of the Presidency to know intimately and in detail all the facts, all the circumstances, all the angles and all the phases bearing upon all of the very many questions that arise in the executive direction of a great nation and of a great people. Of necessity, and in the proper discharge of his duty, he must rely in part upon the assistance of others. I have the faith that the President would have viewed this bill in quite another

light had he known the facts of the Spanish-American War as I from experience so well and so unforgettably know them.

I could not be true to the memory of my comrades of a war over half a century ago, of my pup-tent mate in the Cuban campaign, a 16-year-old boy, who not a year later fell in action in the Philippines, and of many, many others, if I, one of the three veterans of the Spanish-American War in this body—

In other words, in the House of Representatives—

did not today raise my voice to combat with the truth of personal experience conclusions honestly but erroneously arrived at by a later generation. Today I follow the spirit of the men I served with when many of them like myself were boys from high school and the twentieth century was yet unborn. Those who survive are few in numbers. They have no political strength. Their combined votes cannot affect the result in the election in a single congressional district. But I should never wish to return to this Chamber if while I am here I turned my back on them.

May I be personal? I have no wish so to be; I trust that my work here has shown that my interest and my concern and my thoughts are concentrated on the great problems of the present; but I know of no other way to meet and to combat this misunderstanding of the Spanish-American War that has grown in the excitement and confusion of the 52 years of great historical events that have followed.

I went to Cuba with the first outfit after the Rough Riders. Two days after the Rough Riders of Teddy Roosevelt had reached the battle front we were landing from small boats at Siboney, near Santiago. We were in action on the 1st of July 1898, and we wore in the Tropics heavy winter clothes. We had smoking Springfield rifles.

Mr. President, I am sure my distinguished colleague, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], himself a veteran of the Spanish-American War, well remembers those old smoking Springfield rifles.

Representative O'HARA continued as follows:

There were no medical records.

Mr. President, we recall that in those days there were no typewriters, no mimeographs, no multigraph systems, none of the various card systems and index systems and mechanical and other means of keeping records.

I quote further from the statement made by Representative O'HARA:

There was little medicine. The beef was putrid and unfit to eat, and we subsisted in the Tropics on "sowbelly" and hardtack soaked in drippings.

I returned on a transport after the surrender at Santiago, and on board that boat returning to Montauk Point only two were able to be about. There was no medicine. There were no records.

After we returned from that campaign four, five, or six of my buddies from Michigan died. There were no records. I was ill for 6 months. I was in bed, after returning from that campaign. All of my life and including the period I have been a Member of the Congress I have had days when I have had coming on me fevers and chills that resulted from that campaign. I do not know of a single Spanish-American War veteran who has been more fortunate in that regard. Again I repeat, there were no records.

It would be difficult for the younger veterans to visualize the conditions of food, clothing, medication, sanitation, and lack of hospitalization that were faced by the armed services in 1898.

The Representative continues, and concludes with these words:

I can assure my colleagues that there is nothing fictional in the presumption that illnesses now sending Spanish-American War veterans to hospitals—usually and all too unfortunately for brief periods of a few weeks or a few months before the final muster call—are service-connected. The presumption in my mind—and my knowledge, if you please, comes from first-hand experience—is that they are so service-connected. If anyone holds to a different presumption, I will be only too glad to concede that he has something in the way of an argument when he produces anything even to the extent of a scrap of paper showing my own illness at Montauk Point and the illnesses of 40 or 50 at least of my own comrades whom I saw grievously ill and some of whom died of those illnesses. Until such records can be and are produced, for the sake of all that is good and decent let us give the benefit of the presumption to these veterans.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. When a veteran of the Spanish-American War goes to a hospital, such as the Old Soldiers' Home, is he permitted to take his wife with him?

Mr. HILL. No, he does not take his wife with him. He cannot.

Mr. LANGER. This bill does not provide particularly for that; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. This bill does not deal with hospitalization. It does not go that far. All the bill does is to provide for out-patient treatment, which means that the patient can go to a veterans' facility, where a doctor can examine him and treat him and prescribe for him. But he does not get a bed in the facility. He does not get a hospital bed at all. All he gets is the out-patient treatment.

Mr. LANGER. But does he not get \$90?

Mr. HILL. Yes. That is his pension. He is entitled to that. But this bill deals only with the one question of out-patient treatment.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of information, I should like to ascertain whether one of the soldiers, when he goes to a veterans' home, is allowed to take his wife along with him, if he pays, or must he separate from his wife?

Mr. HILL. I would say he cannot take his wife with him. It may be that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is a Spanish War veteran and very familiar with veterans' matters, can shed light on the subject. But I would say definitely that the veteran cannot take his wife with him.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I shall take but very little time of the Senate. While I regret exceedingly the idea of overriding the veto of a President, particularly when the President is attempting to economize as far as our country is concerned, because I am advocating economy now at every level of government, in order that we may move along in the war effort as rapidly as possible,

yet it seems to me that the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama has stated this case very clearly. The veterans of the Spanish-American War do not have well-rounded-out records. There was no opportunity in those days to keep records. I do not know whether it is commonly realized, but at the beginning of the Spanish-American War the Regular Army of the United States consisted of but 25,000 men, which is less than the equivalent of two divisions at the present time. The Army expanded rapidly. Volunteers were accepted, and they were organized into companies, regiments, brigades, and divisions. There was no opportunity to look after the records.

The average age of these men is 74. Many of them are over 80. They need this additional help. It may be interesting to recall that, aside from our having gone into the country of Mexico, the Spanish-American War was the first occasion when American troops entered another country. For less than 3 months, the troops were in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. The amphibious landings which were so successful in World War II were inaugurated in the landing of troops in those different islands. We were not prepared, so far as clothing was concerned. We now have tropical clothing. At that time the men went to the tropics in woolen clothing such as that which was used in the War Between the States. We did not have proper food. At that time, there was no way of keeping food through refrigeration. We did not have even ice. Much of the food was bad, and as a result, the men suffered from dysentery. They contracted malaria. The Senator mentioned the distinguished Member of the House of Representatives as having referred to that. Personally, it took me 6 years to fully recover from malarial fever. However, the Lord has been very good to me; and I have no complaint to make. I have enjoyed good health, regardless of what I sustained in the way of physical handicaps in the course of military work.

So it seems to me that this veto should be overridden. It seems to me that this should be done as a matter of justice to a group of men who pioneered in the type of military work which made it possible for us to win two World Wars. We had to pioneer not only in the matter of clothing, but also in the matter of equipment. The distinguished Senator mentioned the use of black powder. The rifles which our men used at the beginning of the Spanish-American War were effective for only 600 or 700 yards. They were opposed by men carrying the Mauser rifle, which was good up to 2,500 yards. I repeat, the food, the medical attention, and the records of the men were very imperfect. I think the President's veto should in this instance be overridden.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his contribution. The Senator is one of these veterans. He was there. He saw the situation with his own eyes. He experienced all the difficulties and hardships through which those men went.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will permit, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I intend to vote to override the veto. I should like to know what provision is made for the widows of these veterans.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the widows of American soldiers are not so well taken care of as they should be. That applies to all our war widows. I have frequently stated that we ought to do more for the widows, probably, and less for the veterans, although I do not feel that we should do less for the veterans. But I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the widows have not been given proper consideration so far as pensions are concerned. Until but a few years ago, the widow of a major general in the United States Army received but \$30 a month. It is not fair. I expect to speak tonight to the widows of veterans, and I am urging them to petition the Congress that they be given more consideration. I think it is most unfair. While I am on my feet, I want to say that I have gone out to war a good many times. But I think the mothers and the wives deserve very much more credit than even the veterans. The mothers and the wives are the ones who must suffer in their homes, in private. All they can do is to pray that their loved ones may be returned. I think the Government owes a larger duty to the widows.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from a reading of the President's veto message, I think the thing which disturbed him most was the fear that we might be setting a precedent through the enactment of this legislation, a precedent which might give us trouble in the future. I think the President feared that if we pass this legislation for the benefit of our Spanish-American War veterans, we might then be forced as a matter of equity and fairness to pass similar legislation for the benefit of veterans of subsequent wars, World War I and World War II. I do not believe, however, that the President had called to his attention, or had an opportunity to obtain the facts which show the great difference between the way in which the Congress failed to provide for the veterans of the Spanish-American War and the way in which the Congress has provided for the veterans of World Wars I and II. In 1935 we had before the Congress a pension bill for the veterans of the Spanish-American War. President Roosevelt, in advocating its passage, made a very significant statement on this very subject of the difference between the treatment given Spanish-American War veterans on the one hand by our Government, and the treatment given the veterans of World War I by the Government, on the other. I desire to quote briefly from the statement of President Roosevelt, approving this pension measure for the Spanish-American War veterans, in 1935. He said:

The Congress, on many occasions, has recognized that because of complete absence of any system or policy initiated during or immediately following the Civil War, the Indian Wars, and the Spanish-American War, and because of a lack of adequate medical

care from the point of view of modern standards, the veterans of these earlier wars could be compensated and taken care of only through some form of pension system.

In the case of the World War, however, the Congress at the very beginning of the war adopted an entirely new system of care and benefits. This new system applied to all who fought in the World War—

This was reference to World War I—extended to them additional compensation if they had dependents, as well as insurance, hospitalization, vocational rehabilitation, and the adjusted-service certificates (the bonus).

The veterans of the Spanish-American War, now approaching an average age of 62 years (it was at that time, in 1935) had none of these advantages, except hospitalization in recent years. Their case, therefore, cannot be compared to the case of World War veterans. For the same reason the approval of this bill establishes no ground or precedent for pensions for the World War group. Theirs—

Meaning the World War veterans—is an entirely different case.

Mr. President, the two cases are entirely different. Therefore, the fear which the President voices in his veto message of this bill, in light of the facts, when they are carefully examined, and when the benefits given to the Spanish-American veterans are compared with the much greater benefits given to the veterans of World War I and World War II, is not well justified. We are not setting a precedent.

Mr. President, in behalf of the bill there appeared before the House committee Judge Matthias, who is the Chief Justice of the State of Ohio. I wish to conclude my remarks by reading a few words from the testimony of Judge Matthias. Of course, Judge Matthias is a Spanish-American War veteran himself.

Judge MATTHIAS. Well, now, Mr. Davis—

Mr. Davis was the acting chairman of the House committee—

Well, now, Mr. Davis, will you permit me to refer to Judge McCord again, when we were before this committee to which I have previously referred. He told us that he was a wayward individual who was rapidly approaching the end and he realized it. He was asked whether he did not think it time to renounce the devil and all his angels, and he said, "I tell you, in the condition I am in right now, I just don't want to make enemies of anybody." [Laughter.]

I would like to say that Judge McCord is a judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at New Orleans, is a former national commander of the United Spanish War Veterans and a distinguished and outstanding American.

Judge Matthias continues:

In any event, the payment of a bonus and the granting of other privileges to veterans of the World Wars has created no precedents for our Spanish War boys.

So, I will still continue just to talk about the Spanish-American War veterans because they are—I do not know whether you have had the opportunity to observe them as some of us have had—but they are not able to speak for themselves. We believe that they are entitled to this consideration.

But I want to read this statement:

"Too few people realize that 458,000 men served in the 'first war for humanity.' President McKinley called it the most altruistic

war in all history, and every last man went to war without being drafted. It was the only war with a foreign power which has paid dividends in billions. Proportionately more lives were lost from all causes than in any other war, and it left in its wake untold suffering by those who participated. The biting killers that carried yellow fever, malaria, and kindred diseases were discovered as a direct result of that war and the scourges that took millions of lives were wiped out by virtue of the fact that human beings in uniform died then. More millions who served in later conflicts lived because their comrades of the Spanish-American War learned through bitter experience that hearts and kidneys no longer function normally after the body is wracked with disease, and that dysentery caused by drinking foul water and eating rotten meat and maggoty food devours the bowels of those who were compelled to exist on what was served to them."

Mr. President, at this late date the Congress has an opportunity to show its appreciation to those veterans, as they come so near to the end of the road.

Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to say anything on the subject I shall suggest the absence of a quorum so that we may take a vote on the question.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the pending question, in order to save time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the President's veto message with respect to House bill 6217, together with certain correspondence and other matters relating thereto.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement, the correspondence, and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

LET CONGRESS OVERRIDE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF H. R. 6217 FOR SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. President, I have received from numerous Wisconsin folks well-justified protests against President Truman's veto of bill, H. R. 6217, which would provide for outpatient treatment of Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion veterans.

I feel that the President's action was most unfortunate coming as it did at a time when Americans were once again fighting for the flag of their country. We all recognize, of course, that American medical facilities are strained at the present time, but surely we could make an effort to help these veterans—those heroic volunteers—who certainly made a special effort for their country when we called upon them.

I am including at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an exchange of correspondence which I had with the department adjutant—a past department commander—of the United Spanish War Veterans of Wisconsin. I believe that this exchange, like dozens of other messages on overriding the veto, which I have received from other heroes of San Juan Hill, and from their families, expresses the views not only of Wisconsin veterans but of nonveterans as well.

Also that there be listed at this point of the RECORD the names of the officers of this distinguished United Spanish War Veterans organization. I salute these men, who in their elderly years are as true to the colors of their country as they were when they marched off in 1898.

Finally, the reprinting of a fine editorial from the September 14, 1950, issue of Na-

tional Tribune—the Stars and Stripes, published here in Washington.

MILWAUKEE, Wis., September 8, 1950.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Bill H. R. 6217 has been vetoed. That is unfortunate for Spanish War veterans who would benefit by the out-patient treatments provided in that bill. Kindly consider our age and grant us the privileges of that bill by voting to override the veto of the President.

GEORGE C. BAUER,
Department Adjutant and Quartermaster.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1950.

Mr. GEORGE C. BAUER,
Department Adjutant and Quartermaster, Spanish-American War Veterans, Milwaukee, Wis.:

Appreciate your telegram. I agree absolutely with you on vital importance of overriding Presidential veto of H. R. 6217. I will do everything I can along this line.

Kindest regards,

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN,
UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Milwaukee, Wis., September 8, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator from Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you very much for your continued support of bills passed for the benefit of Spanish War Veterans. You have at all times been ready to render us every assistance when needed.

Your reply to my telegram which was received by me today will be read at a large gathering of Spanish War Veterans. In fact I will publicize it throughout our department in the State of Wisconsin, so that all Spanish War Veterans may know who are our friends in the Congress.

Again many thanks and with my warmest regards, with every good wish. I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE C. BAUER,
Past Department Commander;
Member, National Committee on
Legislation.

(Department Adjutant and Quartermaster, George C. Bauer, past department commander, 2867 North Forty-fourth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Department Chief of Staff, Arthur E. Schumacher, 824 Allouez Terrace, Green Bay, Wis.; Department Judge Advocate, William F. Bauchle, past department commander, Box 283, Beloit, Wis.; Department Chaplain, Rev. George H. Willett, Iola, Wis.; Department Inspector, W. W. Biege, 429 Second Avenue, Baraboo, Wis.; Department Surgeon, Dr. Harry G. Oakland, 1651 North Twelfth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Department Historian, Ph. Le Blond, Grand Army Home, King, Wis.; Department Marshal, Richard Barlow, 3022 South Forty-fourth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Department Patriotic Instructor, William T. Schmitt, 529 South Main Street, Janesville, Wis.; Department Service Officer, Richard Strassburger, 1228 South Sixty-fifth Street, West Allis, Wis.; Department Recruiting Officer, Herbert C. Geittman, 523 Oneida Street, Beaver Dam, Wis.; Department Musician, William H. Healy, 2152 North Fortieth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Department Press and Publicity, A. J. Obenberger, past department commander, 1831 North Twenty-eighth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Department Sick and Visiting, G. Fred Huebner, 3027 North Twenty-seventh Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Department Travel Directors, George C. Bauer, past department commander, Albert J. Obenberger, past department commander, John Ebbe, Sr., vice de-

partment commander; Department Legislative Committee, George C. Bauer, past department commander, chairman, A. J. Obenberger, past department commander, J. Stanley Dietz, past department commander, Art E. Schumacher, past department commander, William H. Zuehlke, past department commander.)

[From the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes of September 14, 1950]

MR. CONGRESSMAN!

President Truman, on September 6, vetoed H. R. 6217, a bill designed to grant to veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion the right to out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration in the same manner as if their disabilities were officially recorded as being the direct outcome of their war service. This measure was approved unanimously by both Houses of Congress.

In his message of disapproval, the Chief Executive made four major points. (1) He stated that liberal standards are used now in determining service-connection, that the disabilities suffered by Spanish War veterans are common with those of other older citizens, and that claims of service-incurrence are largely fictional. (2) He asserted that these veterans are liberally recompensed, and that they are already provided with free medical and hospital care, including in-patient and out-patient treatment. (3) Mr. Truman said that the bill's provisions would place a drastic demand upon existing facilities at a time when medical services are strained. And (4), he claimed that the measure's enactment would create a precedent for veterans of later wars, would entail considerable cost, and that such provisions can be made available under social-security laws.

Each and every one of these reasons for disapproval of H. R. 6217 is false. The President has been misled by the Veterans' Administration, which somehow or other seems determined to write and interpret all veterans' laws as well as administer them. We desire, Mr. Congressman, to give you the correct information.

Liberal standards are not applied by the VA to Spanish War veterans; no rating schedules based upon Spanish War experience have ever been promulgated. In most cases their disabilities are peculiar to their service; no official disability records were kept, and they have been compelled for 50 years to treat at their own expense hearts weakened by jungle fevers, kidneys diseased by tropical illnesses, and guts rotted by foul food and water. The disabilities are real as hell.

Pension payments are not at all liberal for men with families whose ages average 75 years. These men are not given free hospital and medical care by the VA; they are not permitted in-patient or out-patient treatment by veterans' regulations. As a matter of fact, thousands of them have sought and have been denied hospitalization even when beds are available. The VA has not built sufficient beds to take care of World War I veterans alone. Spanish War veterans are being literally kicked out of hospitals to make room for younger veterans, some of them being sent home on stretchers. If beds were to be had, these elderly men in critical illness could not get to them unless they were locally situated.

Instead of placing a greater strain upon the VA, this legislation is purposed to relieve that demand, to keep these older veterans out of hospitals, to give them a chance to live and to aid them to meet the minor costs involved in purchasing essential medicines from purses strained by high living costs. Enactment of the bill should bring about savings to the Government, if properly administered.

As to precedents, the Spanish-American War veterans created their own when they

went to war, volunteers to the last man. There is no comparison whatever between their service and that of veterans of later wars, and it is foolish to attempt to create one. Sure, there will be some costs, but the care of war veterans is as much a part of the cost of wars as are the weapons furnished to fight them. And, remember, these Spanish War veterans brought back to this Nation in prizes vastly more than was spent in defeating the Spaniards.

Space forbids fuller argument, Mr. Congressman. The record is complete in committee hearings, and the reasons for treating with these men differently from others have long been recognized by the Congress. Certainly, you will not seriously consider offending them by following the theory that they—or any other veterans—will at any time go under the social-security laws.

Mr. Congressman, these veterans have never asked you to do anything they considered to be unfair. This is not a case of insulting the marines. It is one of crucifying old men who have nobody to depend upon but you. They ask for your vote to override the Presidential veto of H. R. 6217.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hoey	Malone
Benton	Holland	Martin
Butler	Humphrey	Millikin
Chavez	Ives	Mundt
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Darby	Kefauver	O'Connor
Donnell	Kem	Robertson
Douglas	Kerr	Russell
Dworshak	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Eaton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Langer	Stennis
Ferguson	Leahy	Thye
Frear	Lehman	Tobey
Fulbright	Long	Watkins
George	McCarran	Wherry
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Graham	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young
Hendrickson	McMahon	
Hill	Magnuson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. On the issue before the Senate a yeas and nays vote is required by the Constitution of the United States. The question is, Shall the bill (H. R. 6217) pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Those who favor overriding the President's veto will vote "yea." Those who favor sustaining the veto will vote "nay." The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. My colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is unavoidably detained. If he were present he would vote "yea."

I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, as a representative of the United States to the fifth

session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent in attendance on a meeting of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a temporary alternate governor of the World Bank.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate as representatives of the American group to the Interparliamentary Union. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness, and if present, would vote "yea."

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], are detained at a meeting of the Committee on Armed Services considering the nomination of Gen. George C. Marshall. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—58		
Anderson	Holland	Malone
Butler	Humphrey	Martin
Chavez	Ives	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Darby	Kefauver	Neely
Donnell	Kem	O'Connor
Douglas	Kerr	Russell
Dworshak	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Eaton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Langer	Stennis
Frear	Leahy	Thye
Fulbright	Lehman	Tobey
George	Long	Watkins
Gillette	McCarran	Wherry
Graham	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Hendrickson	McKellar	Young
Hill	McMahon	
Hoey	Magnuson	

NAYS—3

Benton	Ellender	Robertson
--------	----------	-----------

NOT VOTING—35

Aiken	Hayden	Pepper
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hunt	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Jenner	Sparkman
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Taft
Cain	Lodge	Taylor
Capehart	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chapman	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Maybank	Tydings
Eastland	Morse	Vandenberg
Flanders	Myers	Withers
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 58, and the nays are 3. Two-thirds of the Members present having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], and I were unable to get to the Senate Chamber in time for the vote just taken overriding the President's veto, because we were in executive session considering the nomination of General Marshall to be Secretary of Defense. Although we hurried to the Senate Chamber we were unable to make it in time to be recorded on the vote. Had we been present we would have voted "yea."

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a statement similar to that just made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The junior Senator from Oregon asks to have the RECORD show that had he been on the floor of the Senate he would have voted to override the President's veto. The members of the Armed Services Committee were in meeting passing upon the Marshall nomination. We left as quickly as we could, upon the ringing of the bell. The roll call on this matter was one of the fastest called in the history of the Senate since I have been here. I want to say that it seems to me that when a committee is in session considering a matter of such moment as the Marshall nomination, adequate time should have been allowed the Members of the Senate to reach the Chamber to vote on a matter so important as the bill and the accompanying veto which have been under consideration by the Senate. But I want it to be understood that I have previously, in correspondence, been on record as in favor of overriding the President's veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Oregon that the roll call was probably a very short one, because so many Senators are absent from the city.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and agree to the same.

ED. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST MCFARLAND,
(By E. C. J.)
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
JOHN B. BENNETT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator reserve the right to object?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I intend to move to refer the bill back to conference. The junior Senator from Nevada does not intend to interrupt at this time anything the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] may have to say by way of debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say for the information of Senators that it is the understanding of the Chair that the conference report is of such privilege that under the rule, it can be called up at once by motion.

Mr. MALONE. I understand that it can be called up, and it has been called up, but I intend to move, and will move at the proper time, that it be returned to conference for reconsideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that unanimous consent had been requested for the consideration of the report, and the Chair was asking if any Senator objected.

Mr. MALONE. I have no objection to bringing up the report. I understand it is a privileged matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN MAJOR DISASTERS.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 8396, Calendar No. 2575.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object,

I wish to ask the Senator how long he believes the discussion will take.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This is the disaster relief bill. If it develops that there will be discussion or debate on it, I shall immediately withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8396.

Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the measure involves long discussion or any serious objection is raised to it, I shall immediately request its withdrawal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection on the part of the minority leader. I should like to ask what the parliamentary situation is. In order that we may not become confused over what is before the Senate, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the unfinished business, what is the temporary business, and what is now proposed to be taken up on motion of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Nebraska should ask: What is the privileged business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will try to advise the Senate. Senate bill 3295, to amend the Railway Labor Act, and so forth, was taken up and made the unfinished business, and then laid aside.

Mr. WHERRY. We understand that to be the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is the unfinished business. Then the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] asked for immediate consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 3375.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the pending business, and that is a privileged matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the immediate pending business. The Senator from Colorado thereupon was asked by the Senator from Arkansas to yield, and did yield, for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Arkansas to move to bring up House bill 8396 for immediate consideration, with the understanding that if protracted debate resulted, it would be withdrawn.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the bill, is it not, which was brought up earlier today, but request was made that it go over temporarily until later, when the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] could have an opportunity to examine it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. It is House bill 8396, to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8396) to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this bill is the same one that I asked the Senate to consider earlier today. Re-

quest was made by the senior Senator from Oregon that the measure be temporarily laid aside until he could have an opportunity to familiarize himself with it. Shortly thereafter the Senator from Oregon advised me that he had no objection to the bill.

As I said earlier today, the bill, which is an authorization bill, provides \$5,000,000 for help to local governments and communities in major disasters. It provides that the money shall be spent through government agencies or through the Red Cross. The bill was passed by the House. The Senate Committee on Public Works considered some four or five bills of similar character, one in particular, S. 2415, which was sponsored by some 40 Members of the Senate as coauthors. After considering the matter the Senate committee concluded that the bill passed by the House, H. R. 8396, substantially conformed to its views and judgment as to what should be enacted, and therefore reported the bill without amendment. Therefore, if the bill is passed by this body there will be no necessity for a conference on it, and the bill can be sent directly to the President.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Some of the bills the able Senator from Arkansas mentioned, such as S. 2415 and S. 3505, contain provisions for relief to such local units of government as a township, and in some sections of the United States a local unit of government that may not be referred to as a township but as a parish.

The reason I ask the question is that in the event of a disastrous flood condition that may strike a community or area, it may involve an entire township, and it may cause great damage to the roads, to the bridges, and to the culverts in the township. It may cause a very great crop loss and building damage, and so forth. In addition to the damage to the individual person, the individual taxpayer would be placed in a very disastrous position from the standpoint of having a township levy imposed upon him to create a fund within the township to reconstruct the bridges and the roads and so forth.

Some of us who introduced legislative measures dealing with the subject had in mind that township units should be given consideration in the enactment of legislation so there would be no question that they would participate in the Federal assistance and relief in a widespread crop damage, personal-property damage, road and bridge damage should occur within a township, causing not only personal loss but heavy township loss, which the individuals would have to take care of by means of special assessments. Such assessments would be placed on the property of the community, and the taxpayers of the community would have no relief from any other source.

I wonder if the able chairman could give us some assurance that it was the intention of the committee when it reported the bill, which contains the language "the State and local governments"

that such "local governments" shall include the smallest local government or unit.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the able Senator from Minnesota will turn to page 2, line 23, he will find "local government" defined. The language is:

"Local government" means any county, city, village, town, district, or other political subdivision of any State.

Therefore, if a township is a political subdivision it would certainly be covered.

Mr. THYE. Last spring in the northwestern part of the State of Minnesota a flood covered much of several townships. As the flood waters receded some of the turnpike were found to be completely washed out. All the hard surfacing and the gravel was gone. Most of the bridges had been damaged. In some instances they were completely washed out, or the footings were washed out, and it was necessary to reconstruct the entire structure. In a case of that kind could we expect, under the bill, that if the township could show that it was confronted not only with a crop loss and damage to personal property but also damages to highways and bridges, some consideration would be given the township by way of extending funds to it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. With respect to highways and bridges, I call the Senator's attention to subparagraph (d) of section 3, on page 3, which authorizes this money to be spent for "work essential for the preservation of life and property, clearing debris and wreckage, making emergency repairs to and temporary replacements of public facilities of local governments damaged or destroyed in such major disaster, and making contributions to States and local governments for purposes stated in subsection (d)."

That is the authority which is contained in this measure specifically with reference to local governments, in the case of property belonging to local governments.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the making of temporary repairs might include throwing some type of small bridge across a creek, to accommodate traffic while the regular bridge was being built. Is that what the Senator has in mind?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The language of the bill at this point is—

making emergency repairs to and temporary replacements of public facilities of local governments damaged or destroyed in such major disaster.

It is not the purpose of this bill, as I understand, to have the Federal Government take over the entire obligation of restoring everything which may be damaged.

Mr. THYE. My question does not seek to establish that the bill would provide complete relief, such as would be provided under an insurance policy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To the extent that this measure authorizes the restoration, repair, or replacement of local government facilities, such as the facilities of townships or other political agencies, in my opinion they are covered.

Mr. THYE. The Federal Administrator of this measure or of the funds provided under it might sit down with a town board or country board and de-

termine that a certain disaster had occurred and that there was a loss which the local unit of government could not in any way sustain, and that the Federal Government should match the funds of the local unit of government, in order to replace the facilities.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The disaster would have to be one of the major disasters of which the bill speaks. This measure is not broad enough to cover every flash flood which washes out a bridge somewhere. The disaster must reach the proportions of a major disaster, as defined in the bill. If the major disaster involved the destruction of roads in a township and all over a country, or whatever was required in order to have the disaster constitute a major disaster, then any local unit of government within the area of the major disaster would be eligible for consideration under the bill.

Mr. THYE. I thank the very able Senator for the explanation, which I am very glad to have, because there has been a question about this matter. Township units have never heretofore, as I understand, been eligible to receive Federal assistance in the event of an emergency in the nature of a flash flood, for instance, or a cloudburst which affects a great area and perhaps washes out the roads and bridges of an entire township.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the able Senator, that I do not think this measure would apply in such an instance, but I believe it would apply only where there is such destruction, caused by floods, earthquake, or storm, as to constitute, under the definition contained in the bill, a major disaster, as such.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Suppose a township had 10 miles of roads washed out. How could the township share in the Government assistance provided by this measure, so far as repairing those roads was concerned?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In my opinion the country could not do so, as I have tried to point out, unless there was so much damage in the area, from storm or floods, for instance, as to warrant the disaster being denominated, under the provisions of this bill, a major disaster, and if the President ordered the agencies of the Federal Government to provide such relief. If the disaster came within that definition and came within the scope of a major disaster, as defined in the bill, then any township or county or district or other local unit of government within the particular disaster area, which would be declared such by the President, would share in whatever benefits were provided.

Mr. YOUNG. How would they share? Would that depend upon the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. This measure authorizes an appropriation of \$5,000,000. It does not fix any amount for any particular major disaster. All the funds would be available and at the disposal of the President, under such circumstances.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the bill provide for any particular matching system?

Would a local unit of government, under such a matching system, have to match the Federal contribution up to the extent of 25 percent, 50 percent, or 90 percent, for instance?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That matter could be handled in either way, under the terms of the bill. The local unit of government could be required to make some contribution toward such restoration.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am interested in learning from the distinguished Senator from Arkansas the details in regard to how the bill would apply to a case in which only two or three or four counties in a State were affected by a flood.

In Virginia we do not have a great Mississippi River flowing through the State and likely, when an overflow of the river occurs, to inundate several States or to flood homes on such an extensive scale as to become a national problem. Our main problem is with flash floods, which may not occur more than once in half a century—such as the flood which occurred at Bridgewater, in the valley of Virginia, last year, and caused a million and a half dollars' worth of damage in a very limited area, or the flood which occurred in Botetourt County, and in Rockbridge County, my home county, a few days ago. I saw an estimate that approximately \$75,000 damage had been done to the main State roads in my home county. Much damage was also done in Botetourt County, and several people lost their lives, and many homes were lost.

Is that the kind of damage for which relief could be secured under this measure, or is this measure limited to floods of the Mississippi River, for instance, and cases in which two or three States suffer damage at the same time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can answer the Senator by saying that, according to the provisions of the bill—

"Major disaster" means any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe in any part of the United States which, in the determination of the President, is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government to supplement the efforts and available resources of States and local governments in alleviating the damage, hardship, or suffering caused thereby, and respecting which the governor of any State (or the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia) in which such catastrophe may occur or threatens certifies the need for disaster assistance under this act, and shall give assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, local governments therein, or other agencies, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it the Senator's interpretation that the bill would apply to whatever disaster the President might be pleased to have it apply?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; but of course the bill is intended to reach major disasters, where the local governments find that it is impossible for them to cope with the situation without having outside assistance.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Today I am receiving many telegrams about the disaster in my home county. If the Senator from Arkansas were interpreting this bill and if the Congress appropriated \$5,000,000 for such disasters, I should like to know whether the Senator would fix upon any given number of persons who could obtain the relief? Or, if the Senator from Arkansas then were the President and were passing upon that matter, if two or three counties were involved and if a great deal of suffering had occurred in those counties, but the disaster was not national in scope though it was a major disaster so far as the persons who were concerned were affected, what would the Senator do in that event?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, I do not anticipate that I shall ever be called upon to administer this act or any other act which imposes such a duty upon the President of the United States. I cannot answer for him, of course.

However, I think we certainly can rely upon whoever may be President of the United States having some judgment, and also having some humanitarian feelings and applying such feelings in making a decision as to what is a major disaster, where people have suffered or are about to suffer, and where the Federal Government should step in and assist.

I might add to what I have said that Senators will find that the bill requires that the Governor of the State shall certify the existence of a disaster.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator to say that in his opinion there could be a major disaster which affected only one city?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should say so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In Virginia there could be a city of 10,000 persons which might be thus affected. The Senator would not apply a size limit to the cities which could secure such assistance, would he?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not done so, and neither would the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Could the bill apply to any city?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, I am not interpreting the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am asking for the Senator's interpretation of the bill, because some day we are going to be at the White House asking for some relief under this measure; and we wish to know what is intended when the \$5,000,000 appropriation is authorized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure the Senate knows that the Congress intends to authorize the appropriation of this stand-by fund of \$5,000,000 to apply to any community or locality in the United States, as I interpret the proposed law, or to any unit of government in the United States, where a major disaster occurs from one of these causes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let us pursue this line of inquiry a little further. Of course a county is a unit of government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the opinion of the Senator, the bill will apply to a unit of government; ergo, it will apply to a county. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; it would apply to a county.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, Mr. President, but I think we can go further in interpreting the bill. Within the local entity, the county, there might be several villages. There might be a small village of 150 persons which could be affected by a major disaster, so far as that particular village was concerned.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the very point I am trying to get at. If the Senator's home and my home were washed away, to us it would be a major disaster.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And if it affects the entire community, that certainly would be contemplated by this bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that is what was meant.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I tried to say. In my opinion it could occur in one city.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I did not get the Senator's answer to the question asked by my distinguished colleague the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young]. There is a township which, as he says, has 10 miles washed out. Does the fund have to be matched by the township?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is for supplemental assistance, but it does not necessarily have to be matched in every instance. Funds for temporary repairs and replacements do not have to be matched.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator feel that the sum of \$5,000,000 is totally inadequate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope it will be adequate, but I could not give the Senator assurance that \$5,000,000, or even \$10,000,000, or any other sum, would be adequate to meet any situation which might arise.

Mr. LANGER. Was it not stated in the report by the Engineers that the total amount of the loss as a result of these floods and disasters would be about \$32,000,000?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not recall that figure. The Senator may be correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I recall, the figure of the Army engineers was based on the losses sustained in large floods several years ago in the Missouri River Valley. But in that instance, the loss amounted to more than \$32,000,000. It amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Army engineers' estimate of the losses in the Red River Valley and in the upper Mississippi was something like \$33,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not think anyone should gain the erroneous impression that it is the purpose that this bill shall apply to all losses occurring in the United States, so that everyone who sustained a loss might be compensated by the Government. If anyone is laboring under that impression, it certainly is not the intent of the

Congress and it is not the intent of the sponsors of the bill. The purpose of the bill is to meet emergency needs, and to meet a situation which the local people cannot meet except at the cost of great suffering and hardship. It is not to make whole everyone who may lose property or may sustain damage. If we were going to do that, of course, the Government would get into everything. But this plan is something which has been used before. We have made appropriations such as this before. At this time we are attempting to provide for a somewhat different administration of the program. Heretofore it applied to but one governmental agency. I remember that at one time it applied to the Public Works Agency. But any agency may be called upon by the President to lend its assistance, its facilities, its tools, and its equipment for the purpose of making emergency repairs or temporary replacements.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that some of the questions indicate that at least certain Members of the Senate have a completely different understanding of the meaning of this bill from that which I am sure is intended. We have had disaster relief legislation before. The basis which has always been applied is that the disaster must be of such major proportions that the governor of the State in which the disaster takes place feels that it is beyond the power of the State and of the local units of government to meet it adequately. The same wording is absolutely repeated in this act, so no new field for the extension of relief is created. It is spelled out much more clearly and effectively in this bill than in the old legislation. I should like to call attention, if I may, by permission of the Senator from Arkansas—

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to call attention to the entire definition of "major disaster," as it appears in subsection (a) of section 2 of the act, which reads:

(a) "Major disaster" means any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe in any part of the United States which, in the determination of the President, is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government to supplement the efforts and available resources of States and local governments in alleviating the damage, hardship, or suffering caused thereby, and respecting which the governor of any State (or the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia) in which such catastrophe may occur or threaten certifies the need for disaster assistance under this act, and shall give assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, local governments therein, or other agencies, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe.

It seems very clear to me, Mr. President, that this provision does not apply except in the case of major disasters, with respect to which governors find themselves unable, with State and local

legislation, to cope with the damage which has been sustained.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, in my opinion the amount contained in the bill is totally inadequate, in view of the facts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It may be. I am not insisting that it is not, but we can always increase the amount. I hope my colleagues will allow me to proceed to obtain passage of the bill. I have imposed upon the very distinguished Senator from Colorado, who yielded to me for that purpose. I feel sure we all want to pass this legislation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move as an amendment to the bill, that at the appropriate place, the figure "\$5,000,000" be stricken out and "\$10,000,000" be substituted. It can do no harm. If it is not needed, we do not need to spend it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, ordinarily I would not be unwilling to take such an amendment to conference. However, the bill we are trying to pass is identical with the bill passed by the House. If we adopt an amendment which the House will not accept—and I think I have reason to believe that this particular amendment might not be accepted—we might find ourselves without anything. I ask Senators to bear in mind that we shall be in session again in January, and when we are in session we can always take care of emergencies if more funds are needed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope that the Senator from North Dakota, who is, of course, proceeding in excellent faith and from motives which I appreciate, will not insist upon his amendment, for the reasons stated by the Senator from Arkansas. A conference would make it very difficult to get this bill passed. The \$5,000,000, if it is authorized, would be considerably more than any single amount we have heretofore provided for disaster relief. We shall be back here after the first of the year, and I shall be happy to join with the Senator from North Dakota in increasing the amount. But I feel that to offer an amendment at this time would jeopardize passage of the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am afraid it would.

Mr. LANGER. In view of that statement, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota withdraws his amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, inasmuch as section 6 of the bill has been stricken, and since that was one of the provisions for which some of us were striving when we introduced the proposed legislation last winter or in the early spring, I ask unanimous consent that a very brief statement be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In urging adoption of legislation to coordinate Federal activities in assisting State and local governments to alleviate human suffering and property damage resulting from disasters such as floods, forest fires, blizzards, or hurricanes, I regret that authorization of grants in aid by the Federal Government for restoration of local public fa-

cilities in stricken areas is not included. Nevertheless, I believe that the pending measure is needed and will prove helpful and I hope that H. R. 8396, as adopted by the House of Representatives, and now reported by the Committee on Public Works, will be enacted in this session of Congress.

It is Nation-wide in application. It provides an orderly and continuing method of Federal assistance to States and local governments if a disaster strikes and the Governor of a State certifies the need for such assistance. It authorizes coordination of Federal activities and provides a framework for prompt and alert action. It authorizes funds to be expended in a manner similar to the authorization for the President's emergency fund, and provides reports to Congress as to the allocation of such funds.

Forty-two Members of the Senate a year ago joined in the sponsorship of a bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters and providing for appropriate coordination of relief activities, and this measure forms the basis for the pending legislation which was subsequently introduced in the House. This is a matter which has had the concern and attention of Members of the Senate in the past but unfortunately the need is not immediately apparent until a disaster strikes in one's own State, and, for that reason, it is difficult to obtain action on a comprehensive relief measure.

We have recently had in Minnesota some of the worst floods in a half century, causing a great deal of damage to property, both public and private, and resulting in suffering on the part of many individuals. We have found it regrettable, in attempting to meet our situation in Minnesota, that a measure such as this was not long since adopted by Congress. Although I know that the provisions of this bill will not affect the still present need for restoration of damaged State and local facilities in Minnesota, I am strongly in favor of the legislation in order that other States, and my own State, in the future, may not have the experience that we have had during the past year when we have found that, in spite of the sincere efforts of Federal agencies, there has not been an appropriate disaster relief organization whereby our Federal Government could fully implement its efforts in dealing with these critical needs when they arise. The legislation now before the Senate will help meet that problem in the future, and I earnestly urge that action be taken in the Senate prior to our recess at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 8396) was read the third time and passed.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR GURNEY AND SENATOR DARBY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there appears in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star a tribute to one of our distinguished Members, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. I shall ask that this tribute be printed in the RECORD. First, I am very happy to read one or two of the sentences which appear in the editorial. The Senator from South Dakota has been in the Senate for a number of years, and we have all learned to love him and respect him. He is a worker. What is needed in the Senate and everywhere in America is a willingness to work.

Only recently the Senate Committee on Armed Services presented to CHAN GURNEY a scroll. It was a very unusual proceeding, but it emphasized what every member of that committee, regardless of politics, felt about the service of this very fine gentleman and Senator.

There are in this particular editorial a few sentences characterizing the man, and quoting from the language of the resolution, as follows:

In his long and distinguished service in the United States Senate, the welfare of his country and the cause of freedom everywhere have received his undivided support. Never has he given way to narrow partisan lines that served the cause of expediency.

Further, the editorial says:

And as second ranking minority member of the committee during the Eighty-first Congress, he has been a tower of strength in working for defense policies. Mr. GURNEY is a Republican, but in his work for national defense nobody ever thought of him as Republican or Democrat. He was a United States Senator, trying to serve the best interests of his country. The people of his State have decided to retire him from politics for the time being. But Mr. GURNEY leaves behind him a record of which they should be proud.

Mr. President, that is about as fine a commendation as could be given. In the Book of Books, it is stated of one that He went about doing good. That can be said of the Senator from South Dakota while he has been in the Senate. As I say, he is not the kind to make a great deal of noise or to become vociferous, but he works. This is a tribute by a newspaper which certainly cannot be classified as Republican. I am very happy at this time to ask that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GURNEY

Members of Congress take a fatalistic view toward the vicissitudes of politics. They know that while many are called, few are chosen by the voters to remain very long at the Capitol and the departure of the defeated, at the end of a session, is marked by no ceremony expressing the regret of those who remain.

All of which makes even more unusual the unusually pleasant action of the Senate Committee on Armed Services the other day in presenting to CHAN GURNEY, of South Dakota, a scroll, memorializing in a formal way the services he has rendered to his country. One of the nice things about this gesture was that it came about spontaneously and represented the unanimous action of Mr. GURNEY's colleagues. Furthermore, it was wholly deserved. In the language of the resolution, "In his long and distinguished service in the United States Senate, the welfare of his country and the cause of freedom everywhere have received his undivided support. Never has he given way to narrow partisan lines that served the cause of expediency."

Though a member of the minority in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Democratic administration leaned on him heavily for important legislation during the war. As first postwar chairman of the newly created Armed Services Committee of the Eightieth Congress, he helped perfect the unification legislation. And as second ranking minority member of the committee during the Eighty-first Congress, he has been a tower of

strength in working for defense policies. Mr. GURNEY is a Republican. But in his work for national defense nobody ever thought of him as Republican or Democrat. He was a United States Senator, trying to serve the best interests of his country. The people of his State have decided to retire him from politics for the time being. But Mr. GURNEY leaves behind him a record of which they should be proud.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I too desire to compliment the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am very glad to yield to other Senators who wish to join in the expressions of the Senator from Wisconsin. But first, I want to say that I join with him completely and wholeheartedly. I served on the Armed Services Committee when it was known as the Military Affairs Committee. I served all through the war with the Senator from South Dakota and I know how truthful that editorial is. I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am happy that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has requested permission to place in the RECORD the newspaper story about our distinguished colleague and I join with him in his commendation of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who is one of the hardest working Senators of the Senate. The Senator from South Dakota does not talk very much, but he does a great deal of work. He is deserving of every commendation that has been or may be made about him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] who is a native of South Dakota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin for saying what he did about the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. I wish I had the capacity to say about him what I have in my heart.

Those of us who were born in South Dakota—and there are five of us in this distinguished assemblage who claim South Dakota as our birthplace—are as proud as we can be to have been associated in the Senate with the Senator from South Dakota. He is a distinguished citizen of our country. He has brought credit to all of us who come from South Dakota. As a native of South Dakota, I am happy indeed that I have had the opportunity to pay this brief tribute to him.

I express the hope that before the session concludes the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], will arrange some special occasion when those of us who feel very kindly toward the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] may have an opportunity to express our tributes to the very wonderful and fine character and amiable disposition of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, whom I deeply regret to see leaving this body.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for the purpose suggested, but I know of no better time than now.

If the Senator from Colorado will permit, I think this is the opportune time to make such observations as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has suggested. If he would rather have some other time set aside, I shall be glad to take it up with the acting majority leader. I certainly think it is fitting that those of us who wish to pay tribute to Senators who are leaving, should make such an opportunity available.

After all, the most pleasant side of our service in the Senate is made up of association, of friendships formed, and the kind memories of our colleagues and friends on both sides of the aisle. The Senator from New Mexico has referred to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], and I heartily concur in the tribute paid to him. I have been closely associated for almost 8 years with the Senator from South Dakota on the Committee on Appropriations, and it is fitting indeed that kind words should be said of him. There are other Senators who are leaving. I did not mean to single out the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from South Dakota, but those Senators were referred to by my colleagues. I am very glad that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] placed in the RECORD the editorial extolling the Senator from South Dakota. It is timely, and I wish to be associated with the Senator's remarks, as well as the remarks of other Senators.

I suggest to the acting majority leader that in arranging his program for the next day or two, he permit Senators to make such observations. I think it would be a good thing to do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, so far as the acting majority leader is concerned, I am willing to cooperate, now or at any other time, in trying to help provide time for commendation of Senators who are leaving the Senate.

While I have the opportunity I should like to say with respect to the Senator from Kansas that he has made a wonderful record in the short time he has been here. He is admired and respected by all of us who have come in contact with him. He has grasped the work of the Senate in a very short period of time, and is discharging his responsibility in a remarkable manner. I am proud to be one of those who are his friends.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I agree completely with what the Senator has said with respect to both Senators. I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the richly deserved tributes which have been paid to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY]. I had the honor and pleasure of serving with the Senator from South Dakota on the Military Affairs Committee throughout World War II. After the war I had the honor and pleasure of serving with him on the Armed Services Committee when the Senator from South Dakota was chairman of the committee. I can bear testi-

mony to the fact that not only was the Senator from South Dakota always hard working and indefatigable in his efforts on both of those committees, but he made many fine contributions to the legislation that involved the winning of the war, and he rendered notable service to the defense of our country after the war.

The actions of the Senator from South Dakota were always characterized by the highest and finest of motives, namely, what is for the best interests of the United States. That was the guiding principle of all his deeds on both committees.

I am delighted to pay tribute to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY]. I have been in Congress for quite a number of years, and I do not know of any man who has served in either body who in so short a time has won a stronger place in the esteem and affections of his colleagues than has the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to associate myself with the beautiful tributes which have been paid so justly to our two distinguished colleagues. Both of them will be greatly missed by the Senate and by the many friends they have made while serving in this body. Both Senators will always be remembered as able statesmen, sterling patriots, thorough gentlemen, and faithful friends.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to add my poor tribute to those so beautifully expressed on the fine public service rendered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. It has been a rare privilege in my service in the Senate to be associated with so stalwart a character. As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, I did not serve with the Senator from South Dakota until the unification program and the creation of the Committee on Armed Services. However, I had served with him as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and more especially on the subcommittee which handled the gigantic appropriations which were made by the Congress for the purpose of carrying on World War II. I have never known a more conscientious public servant.

In the last days of the Eightieth Congress the Senator from South Dakota was carrying a burden which I know would have crushed a lesser man. The unification bill was in conference, and the armed services bill was in conference at the same time. With unremitting toil he brought both of those two important measures to successful conclusion.

There is not one spark of partisanship in his approach to any legislative proposal which affects the defense of the United States. He has kept himself informed as to military matters, not for the purpose of undertaking from his point of vantage to run the Committee on Armed Services, but to enable him to support those who were charged with

that responsibility. He is a great American. His word is his bond. He would be absolutely incapable of doing anything that was at all low or out of color. He will be missed in these Halls. I shall miss him as a personal and devoted friend.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I have served on the Committee on Appropriations with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] throughout both of his terms in office. I can verify everything that has been said about him. Not only has he been loyal, patriotic, and diligent in his work, but he has been extraordinarily able. I have noted over and over again his great capacity for understanding the heart of every issue that has arisen. As the Senator from Georgia has stated, I have never seen the slightest indication of narrow partisanship in his approach to any problem. He has been guided solely by what he thought was best for our country.

I have not had an opportunity to serve with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], but I have met him on frequent occasions on the floor. I think he deserves everything that has been said about him. What has been most notable to me has been the high human qualities which emanate from him.

I am very happy to have the opportunity of adding my brief words to what has been said about both these gentlemen.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that the scroll prepared by the Senate Committee on Armed Services and presented to Senator GURNEY may be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the scroll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAN GURNEY—SENATOR, SOLDIER, PATRIOT, FRIEND

Be it known that all of the members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services intensely realize what the loss of CHAN GURNEY, our committee and Senate associate, means to the Nation and the United States.

He has labored with great fidelity and at great personal sacrifice to build up the military security of the United States, of our allies abroad, and wherever possible to erect an impregnable barrier against the spread of communistic Russian imperialism. In this difficult and arduous task he has constantly taken the initiative to strengthen and improve the common defense.

During World War II he conceived, championed, and vigorously advocated measures which aided the war effort immeasurably.

He was the first postwar chairman of the newly created Senate Committee on Armed Services, at which post he served with conspicuous distinction and in which post he played a leading part in the development of unification within the Military Establishment, the creation of sound postwar military policy and the improvement and efficiency of our armed services in weapons and men.

Likewise, throughout the Eighty-first Congress his decisive influence has unselfishly been brought to bear in support of all vital defense measures.

In his long and distinguished service in the Senate of the United States, the welfare of his country and the cause of freedom everywhere has received his undivided support. Never has he given way to narrow

partisan lines that served the cause of expediency.

We appreciate him as a friend. We respect him as a man of integrity and character. We value his inestimable contribution to the preservation of our country in a war-torn and war-threatened world.

It is with the deepest and most sincere expression of friendship and admiration that we extend to CHAN GURNEY our sincerest wishes for his continued success and happiness.

Though he may be leaving the Senate he takes with him the enduring friendship and respect of all of us on the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate who were privileged to serve with him and who have affixed their names hereto as a token of their affectionate regard.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, HARRY FLOOD BYRD, VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, ESTES KEFAUVER, LESTER C. HUNT, STYLES BRIDGES, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, WAYNE MORSE, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, HARRY P. CAIN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 14, 1950.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not want this opportunity to pass without expressing my great delight at the privilege which has been mine to know Senator DARBY, of Kansas. As a gentleman, and as a great American, all the Members of the Senate have been benefited by their acquaintance with him and their knowledge of his many fine characteristics.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in expressing my high regard for Senator CHAN GURNEY and Senator DARBY. It is with great regret that I realize that they are leaving the Senate, and I desire to be on record as joining with my colleagues in their tributes. In my estimation these Senators have contributed much during their service in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that if it could be worked out a definite time should be extended other Members of the Senate to pay their tributes to Senators who will not return to the Senate at the next session. Some are leaving, and naturally on both sides of the aisle there will be those who will desire to make observations in tribute to their associates.

I did not know that this matter was coming up this afternoon, but I am gratified at the friendly spirit and the voluntary tributes which have been paid offhand, extemporaneously, indicating the glowing friendship in the hearts of Senators.

I have already made some observations about my neighbor and friend, CHAN GURNEY. I wish to add that he has a fine family, and Senators on the minority side, as well as on the majority side, will miss their relations with the Gurney family as they leave Washington to return to South Dakota.

With reference to HARRY DARBY, I wish to say that I have been a Member of the Senate for 8 years, and it has fallen to my lot to have a good deal to do with the party organization in the Senate. It is one thing to get a Senator to take on his responsibilities, it is another for him to take them on voluntarily. I have not seen anyone come to the Senate who has grasped the situation here more quickly and assumed his responsibility more fully, in the length of time he has

been here, than has the Senator from Kansas. He certainly has made himself felt in this body. He is a fine gentleman, in addition to his senatorial abilities, and I express the sentiments of other Senators when I say that we will be very sorry that Senator DARBY and Senator GURNEY are leaving the Senate at the end of this session.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. With respect to Senator GURNEY, it has not been my good fortune to serve on a committee with him. However, it has been my privilege, as it has been that of other Members of the Senate, to see him on the floor of the Senate day after day. His fidelity, his integrity, his courage, his sound judgment, and his modesty, are qualities which have endeared him to the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. I express very sincere regret that we shall not see him as a Member of the Senate in the succeeding years immediately ahead.

With respect to Senator DARBY, likewise it has not been my privilege to serve on a committee with him, but it has been my opportunity in years past to know Senator DARBY in affairs of mutual interest to Missouri and Kansas. Indeed Senator DARBY is almost claimed by Missouri, because he has been so closely identified with affairs of great moment and consequence in our fine city on the western part of our border, namely, Kansas City, that we feel very deeply indebted to him for the contribution which he has made to our own State.

As I have seen him here in the Senate, and as I have heard him eulogized here this afternoon by those who have spoken, I share with all our colleagues my pride in the fact that Senator DARBY has come to our midst, has identified himself with our work, and has been such an outstanding Member of this body. His fine cordiality, geniality, courtesy, and friendship, have been obvious to all those with whom he has come in contact.

I join with the others who have expressed the happiness we have had in our association, and who regret that his term of office is so soon to expire.

I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the Senator heartily for his courtesy. I cannot refrain from asking to be associated with my colleagues who have expressed so eloquently and sincerely their regret at the departure of Senator GURNEY and Senator DARBY. I have had the privilege of working closely with Senator GURNEY, and among his qualities there is one which has not been sufficiently emphasized. He has not only worked intelligently and carefully, persistently and effectively, in the Committee on Appropriations, where I worked with him for many years, but he has done it with exceptional modesty, and has avoided publicity. He has not only not sought the limelight, but he has seemingly

avoided publicity in the splendid work he has done.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words to those which have been expressed by many Senators in paying tribute to our good and fine friends, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY]. It will be a great personal loss to see them leave the Senate. I had the very great pleasure of going on a trip with the Senator from South Dakota shortly after I came to the Senate. I learned to admire him and to appreciate that in all his actions he is always fair and just. Since then I have extended my love for him.

Of course, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] has been in the Senate a much shorter time, but during that span of time it has been my privilege to have been with him and to have had him visit us in our little State of Delaware. Senator DARBY is interested in horses and cattle. His interests are not confined to the State of Kansas, but I learned recently that they extend as far as the State of Virginia.

Mr. President, it is a very happy privilege for me to express to these two Senators my heartiest wishes for success, and I know they will succeed. It will be a big loss to me to see them leave the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not know when I arose that I was going to have the pleasure of supplementing the remarks of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] in regard to the outstanding contributions which Senator HARRY DARBY, of Kansas, has made to the Senate since his appointment to this body in the recent past. I wish to say, as a Republican Member of the Senate, that I am very appreciative of the contributions which HARRY DARBY has made to the work of the Senate. I am very thankful to him for the courage he has displayed on many occasions.

I wish to comment particularly on the nonpartisanship of HARRY DARBY. Time and time again, as his voting record will show, he has followed very definitely a nonpartisan course in the Senate. I think he is one who is devoted to the very high political ideal of placing principle above politics, of placing what he considers to be the welfare of his country above partisanship.

I suppose I am particularly appreciative of my association with HARRY DARBY in the Senate, because, as he has demonstrated time and time again in my relations with him and in my conversations with him, he recognizes the importance of honest differences of opinion within our party. He recognizes the importance of bringing to bear upon the formation of Republican Party policies the points of view of the so-called conservatives and liberals, so that we can hammer out on the anvil of conscionable compromise a sound, middle-of-the-road course of action for our party, devoted to a forward-looking program which seeks to make the Republican Party the party of the American people.

In the Senate of the United States he has been a great credit to the people of Kansas, and to the Governor of Kansas

who appointed him. I am sure that none of my elected colleagues in the Senate will misunderstand the remark I now make, because I mean only to pay a deserved compliment to the appointees to the Senate, without casting any reflection upon those of us who have been elected to the Senate. However, as I look over the roster of the Senate and as I notice the names of the Senators who are going to leave us after this session, I observe that the caliber of the appointees to the Senate has been exceedingly high, as we have seen it demonstrated in the ability of such Senators as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY]. I would not want anyone to infer that I think the Senate might be strengthened by the adoption of an appointive system; but it is interesting to note that the men who have been appointed to this body have carried out the high ideals of representation in the Senate of the United States.

I am very happy that I have had the privilege of coming to know these men. I am sure I bespeak the general attitude of the Senate when I wish them God-speed and great success in their future endeavors, and trust that they will continue to serve the American public in some capacity of public service and public position.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FOR SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Rhode Island has a resolution which he desires to report from his committee, and he believes he can secure action on it in a moment or two. The last experience we had along that line it took an hour to get the measure through, but I shall be glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island to make the report and to ask for consideration of the resolution, and if it does not take longer than 5 minutes, I shall not call for the regular order.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island may have 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado requests unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island be recognized. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Resolution 354, submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on September 15, 1950, and I ask for its immediate consideration and adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 354) was read as follows:

Resolved, That in making the inquiry authorized by Senate Resolution 344, the Select Committee on Small Business, or any duly authorized committee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistance as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or

agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Federal Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection on my part, but I should like to ask a question.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this resolution is merely a request for \$5,000 additional funds for the Small Business Committee, is it not?

Mr. GREEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It has not anything to do with anything else but additional funds for the committee itself, has it?

Mr. GREEN. The Senator is correct. The committee is running rather short of funds, and it wants this small addition to the funds already appropriated.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how much has previously been expended?

Mr. GREEN. Ten thousand dollars.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I dislike to give back any unused time, because I think it establishes an unusual precedent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is well within the limits of the time I yielded to him.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am anxious to proceed with the consideration of the conference report on the so-called slot-machine bill. Senators will recall that early last year, in January or in February, the law-enforcement officers of the States, of the counties, and of the cities, requested the Department of Justice to call a crime conference with respect to racketeering and other crime offenses. The attorneys general of the States, the mayors of cities, the county attorneys, and other law-enforcement officers and agents appeared in Washington and made that request. The Attorney General of the United States arranged such a conference. It was widely attended, and great interest was shown in the work done. The President of the United States took great interest in it. I wish to read a paragraph from the address of Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, at that conference, when the President of the United States was present. His address

was only one paragraph long. The Attorney General said:

Mr. President—

He was referring to the President of the United States—

distinguished representatives of the States and municipalities, United States attorneys, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very happy to welcome you to this conference, a most important conference to Washington. We are here today to begin deliberations that can have a very serious impact for good upon our American society. Some months ago the President of the United States expressed his keen interest in this work that we are about to undertake today. Following this first reference to conditions around the United States with respect to crime, the former Attorney General, our friend, Tom Clark, requested and received from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation a report upon these conditions. Bearing in mind the report on crime conditions in this country and the meeting of the United States attorneys here, it was thought wise to seize this opportunity to launch this crime conference, seeking the cooperation of all law-enforcement officers of the municipal, State, and Federal Governments. We are going to begin today that important work, a work in which all Americans are keenly interested, and we are greatly honored to have with us this morning at this conference the President. It is my supreme privilege to present to you the President of the United States.

Then the President responded with a lengthy speech in which he paid tribute to the purposes and objectives of the crime conference. I shall not read the names of all the persons present, but there are listed in the report which I have before me some names which I shall ask to be made a part of the RECORD. The list begins with Mr. Alan H. Bible, who is from the great State of Nevada, and ends with Mr. George F. Garrity. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names be placed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Alan H. Bible, Mr. Harry McMullan, Mr. Sigurd Anderson, Mr. Roy H. Beeler, Mr. McElroy, Mr. Ralph W. Farris, Mayor deLesseps S. Morrison, Mayor A. E. Cobo, Mayor Joseph Darst, Mayor Fletcher Bowron, Mayor W. Cooper Green, Mayor David L. Lawrence, Mayor William M. Wolfrath, Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Mr. J. P. McGrath, Miss Ann K. Alpern, Mr. Robert B. Morrison, Mr. Benjamin S. Adamowski, Mr. Joe W. Anderson, Mr. Sam M. Wear, Mr. William Marvel, Mr. Howard L. Doyle, Mr. Otto Kerner, Jr., Mr. Gerald A. Gleeson, Mr. Ernest A. Tolin, Mr. John N. McKay, Mr. Herbert S. Phillips, Mr. James T. Gooch, Mr. Whitfield Y. Mauzy, Mr. John D. Hill, Mr. George Morris Fay, Mr. Donald C. Miller, Mr. George F. Garrity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when that conference completed its work it agreed to a series of resolutions. The first resolution which it adopted by unanimous vote of the delegates who were present is as follows:

Resolved, That this conference endorse the idea of Federal legislation to prohibit the shipment of gambling devices into or out of any State where the possession or use of such devices is illegal. Further, requiring Federal registration of all such machines sold within States.

That is the resolution adopted by the conference.

I wish to quote from one speech, that of Mayor Morrison of New Orleans. He said:

We have good reasons to believe that the slot-machine syndicate is controlled by Frank Costello. The shy and retiring czar of the slot-machine racket always understates his interest in rackets and government in his public denials of the facts about his potency and influence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the additional paragraphs of Mr. Morrison's speech which I have marked be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The numerous case records of his interstate operations could take our entire day. For the record I will briefly sketch a well-documented case and the one with which I am most familiar—the Costello syndicate operations in Louisiana.

According to his own Federal grand jury testimony some years ago, Costello moved his New York slot machine operations to New Orleans in 1936. He said that he sent down Dandy Phil Kastel, ex-convict and one-time associate of Arnold Rothstein, to incorporate and run the business. Today he lives and operates in Jefferson Parish above New Orleans beyond our jurisdiction.

Kastel first formed the Bayou Novelty Co., which later became the Pelican Novelty Co., and which today is the Louisiana Mint Co., to handle the distribution of slot machines and other coin devices.

From 1936 until 1946 the Costello-Kastel interests operated in New Orleans under an exclusive monopoly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, after the crime conference had completed its work, the Department of Justice, under the guidance of the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. J. Howard McGrath, undertook to prepare legislation on the subject of controlling gambling devices. They prepared a bill. When they had finished writing that bill they sent it to the Senate. It came, and very properly, to my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because the bill dealt with interstate shipments of gambling devices. That is the reason it came to my committee. That is the reason I have—and the only particular reason I have—for attempting to get the bill passed by the Congress.

I had no part in writing the bill. I did not add one word to it. I did not cross one "t," or dot an "i," or change a comma, or a semicolon, or any other punctuation mark, nor did I make any other alterations or changes in the bill, but I introduced it by request. Our committee considered it, and it was reported by the committee unanimously. It came to the floor, and when it was reached on the call of the calendar it was passed in the Senate by unanimous vote. Then it went to the House, where, after some delay, hearings were held. No hearings were held in the Senate, but hearings were held in the House. I have in my hand a copy of the House committee hearings, consisting of 308 pages. It took the committee 5 days to hold those hearings. Sixteen witnesses appeared before the committee. Thirteen other statements were made with respect to the bill.

The House, in due course, passed the bill with several amendments. The House rewrote the bill, and I think it did a remarkable job in doing so. Its work was very creditable. I am entirely pleased with the work done by the House. The reason the Senate committee did not undertake to hold hearings—and it seemed to us to be a very sound reason—was that the bill prohibited the shipment of slot machines and repairs to slot machines in interstate commerce. We felt that speedy action was a very important consideration, because unless we enacted the legislation promptly shipments of slot machines and repairs to slot machines might have been made all over the United States. Of course, that would neutralize to a great extent the bill we were undertaking to pass. So we pushed the bill as rapidly as we could. But I am glad the House committee undertook a study of the bill. It is to their everlasting credit that they held hearings on it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator, but at some time during the course of his observations I should like to have him answer the question: What is the difference between the Senate bill and the House bill? What is the point in issue between the two Houses, if any, which the conferees resolved, relative to the bills passed by the respective Houses?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very glad to speak to that question. The House struck out the definition of gambling devices contained in the original Justice Department bill, and substituted a much more specific and narrow definition, the effect of which is to limit the bill exclusively to slot machines and to exclude from the bill pin-ball machines. The conferees, I may say, agreed to this change. I should like to point out, however, that the definition is still broad enough to include slot machines which do not pay off in cash, but which pay off in merchandise.

Second. The House bill defines States to include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. It places these Territories in exactly the same position as the individual States with respect to the proposed legislation. Hence, the legislative assemblies of all States and Territories would have the power to authorize the transportation of slot machines into States or Territories. The Senate overlooked doing that. But the House very properly defined the State to include the Territories. That is one other thing the House did.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, if a State legislature convened and passed legislation in conformity with this provision, there could be transportation, could there not, into the State?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. If the legislative body of a State or one of the Territories I have named should enact legislation providing that it is not unlawful to transport slot machines and parts of slot machines

into its borders and says it approves such transport, then the Federal law does not affect such State or Territory.

THE RIGHT OF A STATE LEGISLATURE TO LEGISLATE
IN ACCORDANCE WITH CONSTITUTION—THE
CONTROL OF GAMBLING DEVICES

Mr. WHERRY. The bill would not apply to that particular State, does it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it would not apply to that particular State or that particular area.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The question is, Should a State legislature be able to pass legislation in accordance with the Constitution of the United States without the Federal Government breathing down their neck? Should it be necessary for any State in which the use of such gambling devices might be legal through an act of the legislature of that State at the present time, to pass a new law making the shipment of them into that State legal?

NEW LEGISLATION MUST BE PASSED

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; under this measure it will be necessary for the legislatures of States in which slot machines are legal to pass new legislation providing for the shipment into those States of slot machines or parts of slot machines. However, that responsibility is not a very onerous one to place upon such State legislatures, if they wish to have slot machines shipped into their jurisdictions. It seems to me it would be easy for a legislature to pass appropriate legislation, if that is what the legislature would want to have done.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then one specific difference between the bill recommended by the Attorney General to the Senate and passed by the Senate and the bill passed by the House is that in a State where the use of these gambling devices was already legal, all that it would be necessary to do under the provisions of the Senate bill would be for the governor to certify to the United States Attorney General that such was the case; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would be necessary for the governor to certify—

Mr. MALONE. Or for the governor and the Attorney General.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senate bill as introduced provides that such certification shall be made by the governor of the State to the Attorney General of the United States, and shall be published by the Attorney General in the Federal Register. In other words, that would have to be done if the governor of the State says such shipments are legal.

However, the House very properly voted to place that burden upon the legislative body in the State, because, as the reason was stated to us in conference, that would avoid the possibility of any conflict. The governor might say it was legal and proper and all right, but there might be a difference of opinion as to whether it was legal. It might be the governor's interpretation that such shipment was legal, but there might be a dif-

ference of opinion. In order to avoid any possibility of difficulty or misunderstanding of any kind, the bill as agreed to in the conference requires the legislative body of the State by affirmative action to state that it approves of the shipment into the State, in interstate commerce, of slot machines and parts of slot machines.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

SPECIAL SESSION OF LEGISLATURE

Mr. MALONE. Then it would be necessary, would it not, in order to continue the shipment of such devices into a State, for the State to call a special session of its legislature and at that session to have such an act passed, if the legislature was not in regular session?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know about the necessity to call a special session of the legislature. There is only one State in the United States in which slot machines are legal, and my information is that that State has enough slot machines to last it for 2½ years. So I do not think it would be necessary for that State to call a special session of its legislature. Undoubtedly there will be a session of the legislature within a few weeks or a few months in the State of Nevada; and the regular session of the legislature could enact that kind of law, without having a special session.

TWO AND ONE-HALF YEARS' SUPPLY

Mr. MALONE. Then it would be necessary for a new act to be passed. Where the Senator from Colorado, so far away from the State of Nevada, has obtained his information that the legislature passed a law some little time ago—in 1932 I believe—making the use of such gambling devices legal, of course I have no way of knowing.

I do not know whether the Senator from Colorado thoroughly understands the gambling business.

The junior Senator from Nevada does not understand gambling, but he does know that the State legislature did pass an act making the use of such gambling devices legal, within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

It seems to me that the Congress of the United States is going rather far afield when they attempt to make it necessary for a State to reenact a law, which is already the law, even if the State legislature were in session.

As a matter of fact, the Nevada State Legislature is not now in session, but such a proposed law is about to be approved on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I wish to comment on what the Senator from Nevada has said, before I yield for a further question.

The Congress has the responsibility of legislating with respect to interstate commerce. The State of Nevada does not have that responsibility or that privilege. The State of Nevada can very well legislate with respect to the enforcement of its own laws and the enactment of its own laws.

However, here we have a bill which has for its purpose the restriction of interstate commerce in slot machines. The Congress has placed in this bill a provision that if a State by its own legislature enacts legislation approving the shipment of slot machines or parts of slot machines in interstate commerce into its jurisdiction, that will be permitted.

I wish to say that this bill goes far beyond any other legislation within my experience in protecting States' rights. It protects them all the way from top to bottom. It goes farther in that respect than any other bill I have ever seen.

I do not think it is any hardship on the State of Nevada or any other State which wishes to have slot machines and parts of slot machines shipped into the State, to require that the legislature of the State pass enabling legislation. I think that is no hardship whatsoever.

SPECIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then it is thoroughly understood that a special session will be necessary if there is to be continuity of operation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it is not thoroughly understood that there will be a special session.

Mr. MALONE. If it is desired to continue to ship gambling devices into the State of Nevada and out of the State for repairs, it will be necessary for a special session of the legislature to be called. I think that is obvious to anyone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The State of Nevada already has a 2½-year supply of slot machines, at this time.

Mr. MALONE. That is the opinion of the Senator from Colorado. I would not attempt to estimate the life of devices already there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are in Nevada 7,000 slot machines on which taxes are paid.

TAX COMMISSION CONTROLS GAMBLING

Mr. MALONE. Of course the tax commission in Nevada has full control of the gambling machines which are legal in Nevada. The local police departments have full control over them.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Under the House bill, would it be possible for unbroken shipments of slot machines to be returned to the factory for repairs, just as it would be possible for unbroken shipments of slot machines or parts of slot machines to be shipped into the State of Nevada, if the necessary steps were taken, insofar as the bill calls for action by the State legislature?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it would not be possible for that to be done under either the Senate bill or the House bill. Neither bill provides for that.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REGULATING STATES

Mr. MALONE. I should like to observe that it seems to me that the obvious intent of the Senate and of the House

is not to regulate the States where the operation of such gambling devices illegally occurs, but the obvious intent—and the conference committee approved such a bill—is to nullify the act of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which it passed within the framework of the Constitution of the United States. In other words, the purpose is not to prevent the illegal use of such gambling devices in Colorado, the Senator's own State, and all other States where they are not legal; but the purpose is to prohibit their use in the State of Nevada or any State where they are legal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill does not specify any particular State.

Mr. MALONE. Perhaps the Senator understands exactly how many years' supply of gambling devices there are in the State of Nevada, but the junior Senator does not have that information, but he does know that the legislature, representing all of the people of Nevada, passed legislation making the use of such devices legal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am trying to tell the Senator from Nevada what the Nevada supply of slot machines is, namely, 2½ years' supply.

Mr. MALONE. I do not think the Senator from Colorado knows very much about it to tell him the truth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then why does the Senator from Nevada interrupt me, if he does not believe what I am telling him?

PEOPLE SPEAK THROUGH LEGISLATURE

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask some further question. The Senator's State has illegal machines. The junior Senator from Nevada represents a State where the people have spoken through their legislature making them legal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to reply to questions; but if the Senator from Nevada does not believe the answers I give him, it is rather a waste of time for him to question me. However, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to get these questions and answers in the Record for that very reason. I do not believe that the senior Senator from Colorado knows much about the State of Nevada. I intend to discuss this matter at some length, when it becomes necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That will be wonderful.

Mr. MALONE. It will be wonderful, I am sure. The question still is the right of a legislature of a sovereign State to pass legislation within the framework of the Constitution of the United States without the Federal Government breathing down their neck.

The situation is that when it is necessary to return these machines to the factory to have the machines repaired, such shipments would be impossible under the bill. So the Congress of the United States will, by the exercise of its prerogatives and its authority over interstate shipments, practically nullify an act of a State legislature of a sovereign State, passed with full consideration of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from

Nevada takes such a dim outlook of the free-enterprise system as it exists in the State of Nevada. There is nothing in the world in this bill to keep someone in Nevada from setting up some sort of repair shop or factory or other means for repairing slot machines which are used in Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

MISINFORMATION

Mr. MALONE. Naturally, I conclude that on this point the Senator from Colorado must have received information somewhat similar to that he received in regard to what he states is the 2½ years' supply of slot machines in Nevada, because, having been engaged in the field of industrial engineering for some time—but not in relation to the slot-machine business—I know that it naturally follows that a certain amount of business is required in order to justify or make feasible the establishment of a factory for the manufacture or repair of machines.

Therefore, it is not very likely that it would be feasible to set up such a factory in Nevada. It is no more likely that it would be feasible to have such a factory set up in Nevada than it is that it would be feasible to have a steam-engine factory set up in Nevada.

It is a nice thing to talk about having a 2½-year supply. The Attorney General no doubt gave the information to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, but the junior Senator from Nevada resides in Nevada. He has been in communication with several of the hotels and clubs which use these devices, and no such information has come to the junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to say to the Senator from Nevada that 7,000 slot machines are used in Nevada, and I am sure that if they could not be repaired somewhere else, somebody in the State could set up a shop sufficiently large to repair them. There is nothing very complicated about a slot machine, and I do not take the Senator's dim view of his own State's enterprise, because I know that the people in Nevada are very alert, very wide awake, and do not let grass grow under their feet.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely want to ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that if the Congress, as a legislative body, desired, it could pass a law prohibiting the interstate shipment of slot machines, even though the State Legislature wanted them shipped? So we are in effect here modifying that to the extent of allowing the State to determine its own policy. In other words, it is a matter of State's rights.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for his observation. It bears out what I said a moment ago, that in drafting this bill, we leaned over backwards to give the States every opportunity absolutely to run their own affairs. We have had proposed legislation which attempted to invade the State's jurisdiction. This bill very scrupulously

avoids doing that. It allows every State to run its own business.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

CONGRESS COULD PROHIBIT SHIPMENTS OF AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MALONE. I suppose we could also prohibit the shipment of automobiles in and out of the State. We could do that if the Congress of the United States were to transfer practically all of its authority to the Chief Executive, along the lines of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act transferring to the executive branch the regulation of foreign trade—to the United Nations the right to declare war without referring it to Congress, and so forth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope the Senator does not think of the automobile as a gambling device.

Mr. MALONE. I did not say it was a gambling device, but I say I suppose it would be possible to prohibit the shipment of automobiles in and out of the States if Congress so desired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Congress has power over interstate commerce.

Mr. MALONE. I may say that it is quite a gamble to ride in an automobile, at that; so it might result in saving life if the shipment of automobiles in and out of the States were limited. The Congress might take that attitude if we continue to shift all other authority to the executive branch—the Congress may be relegated to such chores.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think there is much danger of anyone taking that view.

Mr. MALONE. I do not know—I have listened to debates here for 4 years, and we have gone far afield, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know of any Senator who has gone farther afield than has the Senator from Nevada in connection with the offering of very ingenious things of this kind.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was merely going to suggest that there is, first, a great distinction between an automobile and a gambling device, known as the slot machine. If in the protection of morals and in accordance with the public policy of the United States, the Congress determined to prohibit slot machines from moving in interstate commerce, it could be done. But the Congress has not seen fit to go that far in this bill. States' rights have been recognized, and the Congress has provided that any State which wants to have gambling devices, such as slot machines, may pass appropriate legislation and proceed to obtain them. I assume—and I know of no constitutional prohibition—that if the Congress wanted to prohibit the shipment of automobiles in interstate commerce, having full control of it at the present moment, it could do so. I should want to do a little more research, but I suppose it could pass a law prohibiting the interstate shipment of automobiles.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator, of course, knows that the ship-

ment of stolen automobiles or their transportation across States lines is prohibited by Federal law.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. We make it a criminal offense to transport stolen automobiles across State lines.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A question has presented itself to my mind, as I have listened to the colloquy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I say to the Senator that I have some further points to make.

Mr. WHERRY. Pardon me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was pointing out the differences between the House bill and the Senate version.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator complete his remarks, after which possibly he will answer the question I am about to ask. I do not want to interfere with the Senator's presentation, but does this law become operative when the President signs it? What happens in the intervening period of time, between the signing of the bill and its going into effect, say the first of the year? I suppose the Senator from Nevada had that question in mind when he said a special session would be required. What does the bill provide with regard to the effective date of the law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It becomes effective upon being signed by the President. That is understood.

Mr. WHERRY. So there would be an interval between now and the convening of the next session—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Slot machines can be used. There is no interference with anyone's use of the machines.

Mr. WHERRY. It relates merely to transportation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is all. An opportunity has been afforded to everyone. This legislation has been before the country and before the Crime Conference for many months.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If anyone is fearful of running out of slot machines, no doubt he will have purchased a goodly supply of them.

Mr. WHERRY. I was trying to clarify the issues. I was wondering how the matter would be handled in the interval before the taking effect of the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The junior Senator from Nevada indicates he is fearful lest the volume of the business of repairing slot machines in his State would not justify the establishment of a repair shop there. Is it not a fact that every type of slot machine which is legal anywhere in the United States is operated within the State of Nevada?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am sure that is so.

PURPOSE TO PROHIBIT GAMBLING IN ILLEGAL AREAS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say to the Sen-

ator I do not understand, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan said, that the purpose is to regulate morals in a county or a State, or to invade the authority of the State in such matters, but what is attempted is merely to prohibit gambling devices to enter areas where they are illegal. That is why the junior Senator from Nevada was trying to discuss the matter with members of the conference committee, and with the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

If the objective were to prohibit gambling devices from being shipped to and from areas in which they are illegal, then it would be a very easy thing to provide by law that the devices could be shipped where they were legal and they could be returned for repairs, or whatever might be necessary through unbroken shipments, both ways.

The ridiculous thing is that when it is known—and the law is very clear—that slot machines are legal within a State, and the governor certifies that fact to the Attorney General, it is attempting to prevent their shipment unless the State enacts additional legislation. I take it for granted, of course, that the Senate of the United States is not in the business of trying to prevent a sovereign State from doing something which the State legislature and the governor of the State, through regular legislative acts, and acting under the authority of the Constitution, have provided for.

I did not understand that an effort was being made to prohibit in some left-handed manner the acts of a legislature representing the people of a sovereign State becoming effective.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is correct in that. There is nothing left-handed about this. We are dealing with one-armed bandits, but I do not know that they are left-handed bandits.

QUESTION IS A SOVEREIGN STATE'S RIGHT TO LEGISLATE WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. MALONE. I understand. If the Senator will yield further, I may say that statement gets a laugh. It is always possible to get a laugh by such a remark. But I am not in the business, as the junior Senator from Nevada, of getting a laugh on the Senate floor. I am merely trying to protect a sovereign State in its authority, in carrying out the wishes of a majority of the people of a sovereign State, regardless of whether it is my State or the Senator's State, or the State of Louisiana, or the State of New Mexico, in taking whatever action the majority of the people want them to take, under the State's rights, so long as it does not contravene the Constitution of the United States.

I understand my job as a United States Senator is to protect that right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No bill in my time, or any legislation with which I am familiar, goes so far as to protect States' rights as does the bill which came from conference. I want to proceed now to point out some of the other matters which were considered in conference.

Third. It will be noted that the conference report version changes the original Justice Department provision by re-

quiring that the various States specifically pass laws exempting them, if they so desire, from the provisions of the new law, instead of merely allowing the governor to certify to the Attorney General, that the State now has such a law. That is what we have been talking about. The effect, therefore, is to require each State legislature to enact legislation exempting the particular State or a particular subdivision of it from the effect of the Federal law. The House eliminated the provision which would have barred the exportation of slot machines to foreign countries.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If I understand correctly, what the provision requires is that a State can pass a law in compliance with the Federal statute, to receive into that State slot machines or parts, and so forth, so the slot machine could come into the State. A State in which slot machines may be manufactured could also pass laws permitting slot machines to come into its jurisdiction. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to get the issues clear. So that the State which manufactures them, if it wanted to receive slot machines for repairs, would be protected under this bill, so that a State which imported them, in the first place, when they needed repairs, could send them back and have them repaired in the State in which they were manufactured in the first place, is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is absolutely correct. The Senator from Nevada is complaining because the bill does not permit his State to ship slot machines to other States for repair. The bill does provide for that very thing, and it provides for it in this way: Most slot machines are manufactured in Chicago and shipped out of Chicago. Chicago is the slot-machine capital of the world. This bill gives the State of Illinois the right to authorize and approve shipments of slot machines into Chicago. It could approve their being shipped into Chicago in unbroken lots, or into the whole State of Illinois, if it wished to do so. The State of Illinois can do that. If the State of Illinois does it, of course the State of Nevada can ship its slot machines to Chicago for repairs. Chicago can send them back to Nevada. That is what the bill provides. It seems to me that a law could not be more liberal.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the bill say that a State legislature must reenact the law making gambling legal so that gambling devices may be shipped into the State, or that it is legal to use them in the State?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They can do either one. The legislature has complete control.

Mr. MALONE. But the legislature in Illinois would have to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the Legislature of Illinois would have to do it.

STATE WHERE GAMBLING IS ILLEGAL MUST PASS
LEGISLATION

Mr. MALONE. In order to take care of a State in which gambling is legal, and to permit gambling in that State, legislation would have to be passed by a State which may have no particular interest in such matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is stretching the point. If the State of Illinois wants to permit the repair of slot machines shipped into it from Nevada, it can provide for that very thing by legislation. The bill would take care of both States, if they wished to take care of themselves.

Proceeding with the conference report, it requires manufacturers and dealers in gambling devices to register annually with the Attorney General of the United States. The original Justice Department bill would have required registration with the Collector of Internal Revenue in the collection district in which the business is carried on. The conference report adopted the House language with respect to that matter. They would register with the Attorney General of the United States.

The conference report modifies section 5 of the Senate bill by extending the prohibition to American-flag ships on the high seas.

Furthermore, the conference report consolidates the penalty sections into a single penalty of a \$5,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment for violations of all provisions of the bill. The Justice Department bill, which the Senate had passed, provided two classes of penalties, namely, a \$5,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment for violation of section 2, which prohibits interstate transportation of gambling devices, and violation of section 5, which prohibits the manufacture, transport, possession, or use of gambling devices on Federal territory; and a \$2,000 fine and 1 year's imprisonment for violation of section 3, which deals with the registration of manufacturers and dealers of devices, and violation of section 4, which deals with the marking of packages containing gambling devices. Those are the changes which have been made by the House in the original Justice Department bill, and which have been approved by the conferees.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to get this matter clear in my mind, because there seem to be many issues involved. Of course, a State legislature can go as far as it cares to go with respect to the importation into its borders of slot machines. That is, they can write a law permitting the repair or manufacture of them, and still not allow their use.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. They can do that.

Mr. WHERRY. It is not necessary to permit gambling in the State of Illinois, for example, if the legislature does not wish to permit it, and still permit slot machines to come into the State for repair, or for manufacturers to send them out of the State. Am I correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is correct. They can send them out

only to a State into which it is legal to send them. At the present time there is only one State into which it is legal to send slot machines, and that is the State of Nevada. Therefore under the bill it would be possible to have a flow of slot machines from Nevada to Chicago and from Chicago to Nevada. All that would be required would be an act of the legislature providing for it.

Returning to the conference report, on August 29 I received a letter from the Justice Department, signed by Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General. It deals with the House bill and the conference report which was adopted yesterday. The Attorney General wrote the first bill, which was passed by the Senate. The bill went to the House and it was changed by the House. We on the committee were eager to know whether the Attorney General was satisfied with the House bill, because of the origin of the legislation. The origin of the legislation—and I wish Senators to keep this in mind—came from the crime conference, from mayors of the great cities of the country, the attorneys general of the States, and the county attorneys of the many counties. We wanted to know what the Attorney General in his commitments to these communities thought about the bill. He said:

In response to your request, we have examined S. 3357, an act to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, as it was amended and passed by the House of Representatives on August 28, 1950. While the amendments effect substantial changes in the measure as it passed the Senate on April 19, 1950, it is our belief that these amendments do not alter the basic objectives of the original bill. In our view, if the House amendments are accepted by the Senate, the Congress will have enacted a highly creditable piece of legislation, in keeping with the recommendations made on the subject of gambling devices by the Attorney General's Conference on Organized Crime.

The letter is signed by Mr. Peyton Ford.

So we have kept faith with the crime conference in submitting this conference report.

We have in the Senate a special committee appointed to investigate organized crime in interstate commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I am trying to get all the information I can.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska or to any other Senator who wishes to ask questions.

Mr. WHERRY. The other evening when this bill came up for discussion the Senator moved to concur in the House amendments, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the Senator withdrew the motion and asked for a conference, did he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The conferees are reporting the bill with the House amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That is really the point at issue?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. I wish to read to the Senate some of the things that happened in conference yesterday. The conference lasted an hour. This is a part of the record that was made. The House conferees rejected two amendments proposed by the Senate conferees. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Nevada to this language. The House conferees rejected two amendments proposed by the Senate conferees. The first amendment would have permitted the use of gambling devices as defined in the bill in any place owned or controlled by the United States if such place is in a State or subdivision thereof which has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State or such subdivision from the provisions of section 2 of the bill.

The second amendment—and this is the amendment which the Senator from Nevada has been very much interested in—would have permitted a State which had enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State from the provisions of section 2 of the bill to ship gambling devices from such State for repairs into another State. The House conferees felt these two amendments were incompatible with the objectives of this proposed legislation, and they voted them down. They told us of course they could not consider them, and they advanced what I considered to be very sound arguments why those proposals, made by the Senate conferees, could not and should not be granted.

The Senate has created a Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. Senators will recall that the committee is made up of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Mr. Rudolph Halley is chief counsel. On August 18, 1950, the special committee issued an interim report. I should like to read one paragraph from the interim report.

The committee favors and recommends the enactment into law of S. 3357, popularly known as the slot-machine bill, which would prohibit the transportation of these gambling instruments in interstate commerce.

Mr. President, that is the recommendation of our own committee, that this proposed legislation be enacted.

I wish to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the bill as it was passed by the House and as adopted in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act (a) the term "gambling device" means—

(1) any so-called "slot machine" or any other machine or mechanical device an essential part of which is a drum or reel with insignia thereon, and (A) which when operated may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or (B) by the operation of which

a person may become entitled to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property; or

(2) any machine or mechanical device designed and manufactured to operate by means of insertion of a coin, token, or similar object and designed and manufactured so that when operated it may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property; or

(3) any subassembly or essential part intended to be used in connection with any such machine or mechanical device.

(b) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

(c) The term "possession of the United States" means any possession of the United States which is not named in paragraph (b) of this section.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport any gambling device to any place in a State, the District of Columbia, or a possession of the United States from any place outside of such State, the District of Columbia, or possession: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to transportation of any gambling device to a place in any State which has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State from the provisions of this section, or to a place in any subdivision of a State if the State in which such subdivision is located has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such subdivision from the provisions of this section.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with or reduce the authority, or the existing interpretations of the authority, of the Federal Trade Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 41-58).

SEC. 3. Upon first engaging in business, and thereafter on or before the 1st day of July of each year, every manufacturer of and dealer in gambling devices shall register with the Attorney General his name or trade name, the address of his principal place of business, and the addresses of his places of business (in such district). On or before the last day of each month every manufacturer of and dealer in gambling devices shall file with the Attorney General an inventory and record of all sales and deliveries of gambling devices as of the close of the preceding calendar month for the place or places of business (in the district). The monthly record of sales and deliveries of such gambling devices shall show the mark and number identifying each article together with the name and address of the buyer or consignee thereof and the name and address of the carrier. Duplicate bills or invoices, if complete in the foregoing respects, may be used in filing the record of sales and deliveries. For the purposes of this act, every manufacturer or dealer shall mark and number each gambling device so that it is individually identifiable. In cases of sale, delivery, or shipment of gambling devices in unassembled form the manufacturer or dealer shall separately mark and number the components of each gambling device with a common mark and number as if it were an assembled gambling device. It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to sell, deliver, or ship any gambling device which is not marked and numbered for identification as herein provided; and it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, deliver, or ship any gambling device without having registered as required by this section, or without filing monthly the required inventories and records of sales and deliveries.

SEC. 4. All gambling devices, and all packages containing any such, when shipped or transported shall be plainly and clearly labeled or marked so that the name and address of the shipper and of the consignee, and the nature of the article or the contents of the package may be readily ascer-

tained on an inspection of the outside of the article or package.

SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, transport, possess, or use any gambling device in the District of Columbia, in any possession of the United States, or within Indian country as defined in section 1151 of title 18 of the United States Code or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States as defined in section 7 of title 18 of the United States Code.

SEC. 6. Whoever violates any of the provisions of section 2, 3, 4, or 5 of this act shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 7. Any gambling device transported, delivered, shipped, manufactured, reconditioned, repaired, sold, disposed of, received, possessed, or used in violation of the provisions of this act shall be seized and forfeited to the United States. All provisions of law relating to the seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of vessels, vehicles, merchandise, and baggage for violation of the customs laws; the disposition of such vessels, vehicles, merchandise, and baggage or the proceeds from the sale thereof; the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures; and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this act, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof: *Provided*, That such duties as are imposed upon the collector of customs or any other person with respect to the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, merchandise, and baggage under the customs laws shall be performed with respect to seizures and forfeitures of gambling devices under this act by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Attorney General.

SEC. 8. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are declared to be severable.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement by me describing the bill, which will be somewhat repetitious, but I think it might well go into the RECORD, as it covers the whole subject.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

Mr. President, I think it is desirable that a brief explanation be made before requesting approval of the conference report on S. 3357, the bill prohibiting interstate transportation of certain gambling devices.

Initially, the Senator from Colorado desires to emphasize that he takes no pride of authority in this legislation. Senators should understand, however, that this bill is endorsed by practically every State and municipal law enforcement official in this country. They are on record as wanting this legislation. They and their representatives met here last February—mayors, State attorneys general, police chiefs, county attorneys—in a national crime conference which was addressed by President Harry Truman. After several days of deliberation, they passed a number of resolutions. The very first of these was a resolve requesting the Federal Government to enact legislation prohibiting the interstate transportation of

certain gambling devices, particularly slot machines. The Attorney General of the United States drafted such legislation and sent it to the Senate and House of Representatives with a request that it be enacted. The request was referred respectively to the Senate and House Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and on April 4, 1950, I introduced the bill by request. On April 12 our committee considered the bill in executive session and ordered it reported favorably without amendment. On April 19 the Senate passed the bill unanimously on the consent calendar. The bill was then referred to the House Committee and beginning on April 27 that committee held 5 days of hearings, subsequently reporting the bill on August 20 with amendments. In my judgment and in the view of the Department of Justice, the House amendments materially improve the bill.

Following House passage, a sudden interest developed in the legislation, concern began to be expressed about its enactment. Suggestions were even made that this bill infringed on States' rights, despite the fact that it was the States themselves, through their law-enforcement officials who initiated the bill and urged its enactment. Let me say right here and now that this is one of the few bills in the last 2 decades which is scrupulous about States' rights; it keeps the Federal Government out of State and local police powers; no Federal official is going to become an enforcement officer in any State or locality. All it does is exercise the constitutional duty of the Federal Government with respect to interstate commerce by denying the avenues of such commerce to slot machines unless a State has made the operation of slot machines legal within that State.

In view of the new interest expressed in the legislation and suggestions made that certain changes be made in the House form of the bill, we decided to ask the House for a conference. That conference was held yesterday afternoon from about 4:15 to 5:15 p. m.

At that conference I proposed, on behalf of the Senate, not only the adoption of the Senate bill, but also specifically two additional new amendments. One would have permitted a State in which slot machines are legal to ship such machines out to another State for repair. The House conferees unanimously rejected that amendment, explaining that in the first place such an amendment would nullify the entire bill, since it would permit a State in which slot machines are legal, such as Nevada, to ship machines into every State in the Union, whether or not slot machines are legal in such States. The House conferees also pointed out that if it was desirable or necessary for machines to be shipped into a State for repair or renewal, all that was necessary is for the State to pass legislation making such shipment legal.

The second amendment I offered on behalf of the Senate was to permit the legal operation of slot machines on Federal property in States where the operation of slot machines is legal. Again, the House conferees unanimously rejected the amendment, explaining that such an amendment would establish far-reaching precedents with respect to State control over Federal territory.

Thereafter, we reviewed in detail each of the House amendments, eight in all.

The House struck out the definition of gambling devices contained in the original Justice Department bill and substituted a much more specific and narrow definition, the effect of which is to limit the bill exclusively to slot machines and to exclude from the bill such other coin-operated devices as pin-ball machines. However, the definition in the House bill is still broad enough to include slot machines which do not pay off in cash and are paid off in merchandise or cash over the counter.

The House bill defines "State" to include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. This places these territories in exactly the same position as the individual States. Hence, the legislative assemblies of all States and Territories would have the power to authorize the transportation of slot machines into such State or Territory.

It will be noted that the House version tightens the original Justice Department language by requiring the various States to specifically pass laws exempting such States from the provisions of the new law instead of merely allowing the governor to certify to the Attorney General that the State now has such a law. The effect therefore, is to require each State legislature to enact legislation exempting that State or a particular subdivision of it from the effect of the Federal law. The House eliminated a provision which would have barred exportation of slot machines to foreign countries.

Another House amendment requires every manufacturer and dealer in gambling devices to annually register with the Attorney General of the United States. The original Justice Department language would have required registration with the Collector of Internal Revenue in the collection district in which the business is carried on.

The House modifies section 5 of the Senate bill by extending the prohibition to American-flag ships on the high seas.

Also the House consolidated the penalty sections into a single penalty of \$5,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment for violations of all provisions of the bill. The Justice Department has provided two classes of penalties: A \$5,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment for violation of section 2, which prohibits the interstate transportation of gambling devices, and violation of section 5, which prohibits the manufacture, transport, possession or use of gambling devices on Federal territory; and a \$2,000 fine and 1 year imprisonment for violation of section 3, which deals with the registration of manufacturers and dealers of gambling devices, and violation of section 4, which deals with the marking of packages containing gambling devices.

It should be emphasized that the Department of Justice, which drafted the original bill, approves of the changes made by the House. I want to read from a letter from Mr. Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General, giving the Justice Department's views on the amended bill:

"DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In response to your request, we have examined S. 3357, an act to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, as it was amended and passed by the House of Representatives August 28, 1950. While the amendments effect substantial changes in the measure as it passed the Senate, April 19, 1950, it is our belief that these amendments do not alter the basic objectives of the original bill. In our view, if the House amendments are accepted by the Senate, the Congress will have enacted a highly creditable piece of legislation, in keeping with the recommendation made on the subject of gambling devices by the Attorney General's Conference on Organized Crime."

Mr. President, some questions have been raised as to the specific effect of this legislation on States, or parts of States, where the possession and operation of slot machines is legal. Some Senators may have the impression that since opposition has been expressed by the junior Senator from Nevada, his State may be adversely affected by enactment of the bill.

The facts are, Mr. President, that this legislation does not impair or impede the legal operation of a slot machine in Nevada, or any place else where they are legal now, or if made legal by subsequent enactment of State or Territorial legislatures. On the contrary, it is reasonable to draw the conclusion that such places may actually be benefited by the enactment of this legislation.

For example, in Nevada slot machines are licensed by the State government. They bring in a sizable tax revenue. The operators of slot machines in Nevada, I am reliably informed, have in stock some two and a half times the number of machines actually in operation at any one time. Whether such a surplus of machines was purchased in anticipation of the enactment of this legislation I cannot say. But, operation of slot machines will continue in Nevada after enactment of this legislation just as before. There will be this added advantage to Nevada. It may well become an oasis of legal operation of the machines in the United States and in that respect will attract even more customers than ever before to play them.

Moreover, if enactment will actually result in the closing down of the large national manufacture of such machines, it is quite probable that some enterprising Nevadans will set up a repair machine shop in Reno or Las Vegas or some other city and maintain repair and replacement facilities for the machines. Thus, the enactment of the bill may actually result in promotion of small business in Nevada.

The junior Senator from Nevada has told me that he is concerned about the fact that Nevada operators of slot machines will not be able to send their broken-down machines back to the factory and get them repaired, since the bill would prohibit the interstate transportation of slot machines into States where they are not legal. I already pointed out that I offered such an amendment and that it was promptly and unanimously rejected by the House conferees as making a nullity of the entire bill. The slot-machine manufacturer in the Midwest who is now opposing the enactment of this bill says quite frankly that if it is enacted, he will shut up shop, since the legal market for machines is not large enough to warrant his operation. In short, at the present time he has no objection to helping violate State law by shipping his machines into States where the machines are illegal, but he does not want to tangle with the Federal Government when and if interstate shipment is made illegal by Federal law. So, presumably, he will stop manufacture if this bill becomes law. Obviously, then, the bill will have the effect of decentralizing the slot-machine manufacturing industry; wherever slot machines are legal small repair shops and even factories will be set up to service and maintain them.

This, then, is a great opportunity for those who favor small independent business. Frankly, I am somewhat surprised that the junior Senator from Nevada, who constantly is talking about the free-enterprise system and building up of small business, should bleed for the large slot-machine manufacturer in Illinois. And lest anyone is ready to shed tears over the Illinois manufacturer of slot machines, the Senate will be comforted to know that the manufacturer is a multimillionaire, full of years and wisdom and ready to retire to either his Louisiana plantation or his Illinois farm, as his fancy moves him.

The junior Senator from Nevada also has expressed some disfavor with a House amendment which would require the Legislature of Nevada, or any other State, to pass a bill permitting slot machines to be shipped into the State in conformity with this legislation. As the bill was originally drafted by the Justice Department, and as it passed the Senate, all that was required was for the governor of a State to certify to the Attorney General of the United States that his State has such a law. But during further consideration of this provision, and in view of the criminal penalties attached, legal experts felt that it was not good law to create a legal presumption simply on the basis of a governor's certification, and hence the House modified that provision.

Some concern has been expressed over the effect of the legislation on the operation of slot machines in various fraternal and social

organizations, including officers' clubs on Federal property, such as Army posts. The bill does not change the existing situation with respect to slot-machine operation in private clubs or fraternal organizations in any State. That remains a matter of State enforcement, and the Federal Government is given absolutely no new enforcement powers by this bill. Where slot machines today are operated despite State laws making such operation illegal, I assume such operation will continue at the pleasure or discretion of the State and local enforcement officials. However, as to Federal property, the bill does prohibit the possession or use of slot machines. Frankly, I do not see how the Congress can prohibit the interstate shipment of devices which everybody acknowledges as "one-armed bandits" which do not give the customer an even break, and at the same time permit and encourage their operation on Federal territory. If such machines are bad, they are bad, and we have no business exempting Federal property from the bill and thus make every Army post or officers' club a gambling oasis.

I say again what I emphasized in the beginning, this legislation is not personal to the Senator from Colorado, or any other member of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Senator from Colorado has no pride of authorship; the bill came directly from the law-enforcement officials of the States and cities of this country; they urged its enactment in the first resolve of the national crime conference held here early this year; the language was drafted by the Department of Justice, and the bill was introduced by me by request in my position as chairman of the committee. Our committee considered it; reported it unanimously; and the Senate passed it without a dissenting vote. The House of Representatives, in turn, passed it unanimously, I believe. It is now before us for adoption of a conference report which concurs in House amendments which the Department of Justice formally informs us are completely satisfactory. The Senator from Colorado has done his duty. The Senate can do as it pleases about the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to repeat the chronological history of the bill.

Following the crime conference and action by the Department of Justice, a bill was sent to the Senate, and I introduced it by request. I wish to make a point about that request. It was not my bill, I had no part in its formulation. I did not write any part of it. I have no more interest in that bill than has any other Senator or any other citizen. I do have a profound respect for the law enforcement officers of the United States and of the mayors of the cities of the United States, and when they assemble and say they are having great difficulty in enforcing the laws, I feel that I have some responsibility in trying to help them, because they have had a very difficult and onerous job. Therefore I introduced the bill by request on April 4, 1950. A similar bill was introduced in the House at the same time.

On April 12, 1950, the bill was considered in executive session in the committee and ordered reported favorably.

On April 12, 1950, it was reported by me to the Senate, and Senate Report 1482 was filed.

On April 19, 1950, the Senate passed the bill.

On April 20, 1950, it was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

On April 27, May 2, 3, 4, and 5, 1950, hearings were held 5 days of hearings, by the House committee.

On July 27, 1950, the bill was considered in executive session of the committee and ordered reported with amendments.

On August 20, 1950, the bill was reported by Mr. ROGERS, who filed a report on the bill, House report 2769.

On August 28, 1950, the House passed the bill with amendments.

On September 18, 1950, the conference report was agreed to by the House, the report which we have before us at the present time.

If there are any questions any Senators desire to ask which I can answer, I shall be glad to attempt to help explain the provisions of the bill. If not, I wish to say just one last word in conclusion.

I hope that at a very early hour the Senate may pass upon the conference report. I believe it is in the public interest and against the interest of racketeers and professional gamblers throughout the country. So I hope the conference report may be approved and the bill enacted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to pay a very high tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its members for their handling of this bill, and for the very thorough consideration it has been given. While the chairman and the members of the Special Committee to Investigate Crime in Interstate Commerce have only commenced their investigation—because of the sessions of the two Houses of the Congress we have not been able to have as many hearings as we will have later—we are convinced, and our report is unanimous, on the point of approving the legislation that is proposed here today, and on commending the Senate and the House committees for bringing it up for the consideration of the Senate and the House.

As the distinguished Senator from Colorado has stated, we feel that these gambling devices are not only bad in themselves, but they are a part of the apparatus that is used in places which result in the assembling of people for other types of criminal activities. I believe the cause of better law enforcement, and reducing organized crime in the United States, will have taken a great forward step, and there will be less crime if the proposed legislation shall be enacted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am very pleased to have this observation from the Senator from Tennessee, who has devoted a great deal of time and energy and talent to the very difficult questions relating to crime. I am very glad indeed, and our committee is glad, to have his approval.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I, too, should like to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,

together with the chairman of the subcommittee, for the splendid work they have accomplished in getting the bill to this point in its legislative history.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will accept the conference report, and that the bill will become the law of the land, for the reason that through the use of this instrument of gambling throughout the United States in certain areas huge fortunes are being gathered together by gangsters, ex-criminals, and that type of people, and the great injury to our economy from this activity is that they are now getting into what we might call and what we should call legitimate channels of our over-all economy. They are buying utilities, they are controlling banks, they are going into real estate, they are going into the distilling business, and they are following in those activities exactly the same practices and same methods which they used in their gambling activities.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that the Senate will, at a very early hour this afternoon, adopt this conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Wyoming for his observations. I know he is very much interested in the whole problem of crime prevention, and he is associated with the very distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and they are both doing grand work, along with the other members of the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further while the Senator from Wyoming is on the floor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to say that I was very much impressed by the statement of the Senator from Wyoming some time back. Actually, legislation of this kind did much to help the small fellow, because a great deal of the wages and earnings of such men, which should go for food and necessities of life, according to the experience of the Senator from Wyoming, while he was Governor of his State, were diverted to other purposes, and resulted in the depletion of the family income.

PROTECTION OF INVESTORS IN LARGE CORPORATIONS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on August 8, 1949, I introduced a bill, S. 2408, designed to compel the adoption of certain basic standards for the protection of investors in large corporations. Briefly, the bill would apply to all large corporations with substantial public interest—defined as those with at least \$3,000,000 of assets and 300 security holders—the disclosure, proxy, and insider-trading provisions which have been part of the working code of listed and specially regulated companies for many years under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and other acts.

These provisions require financial statements reflecting an accurate picture of the financial condition of the business to be filed annually with the Securities and Exchange Commission; they require proxy solicitations to disclose essential information about the

matters to be voted upon at the meeting; and they require insiders to report any trading they may do in their company's securities and to pay back to the company any short-term profits made from such trading. Purely because of a historical inadvertence, which I described when I introduced the bill, only corporations subject to either the Securities Exchange Act, the Public Utility Holding Company Act, or the Investment Company Act, are today required to comply with those provisions. S. 2408 proposes to remedy this historical inadvertence and extend these standards to all companies similarly situated.

When I introduced S. 2408, I invited comments from all interested persons. The response to this invitation was most gratifying. I received thousands of letters, which have assisted me in reaching a conclusion upon the merits of the various provisions of the bill. These letters, and the testimony presented at the hearings upon the bill, which were held in February, have convinced me that the need for such legislation is clear and imperative.

However, the Banking and Currency Committee, as everyone knows, was continuously faced with one piece of urgent legislation of tremendous national importance after another, and because the committee felt this legislation required a considerable amount of study, and the time element was not as important as was the case with such legislation as rent control, housing, price and production control, it was decided the subcommittee should further study the legislation with a view to action on it one way or the other at the next session.

I therefore plan to reintroduce the measure as soon as the next Congress meets. In the meantime, I should like to discuss certain matters brought to light during the hearings as well as by various independent inquiries I have made, so that there may be adequate opportunity, in the interval before the next Congress meets, to consider and discuss the legislation in the light of this information.

The "corporation" is today a well-established instrument of our economy. I believe the great majority of corporate officials recognize their offices are public trusts. Consequently, the corporate device is today a legitimate and effective instrument for obtaining large supplies of capital to further business enterprise. If it is to remain such, I believe it essential that the confidence of investors be maintained and corporate responsibility be made the law of the land. S. 2408 is designed to accomplish this purpose.

Industry, the Executive, and Members of this Congress have all repeatedly expressed concern over the dearth of venture capital. There must be a continuous flow of such capital if we are to continue our present dynamic business expansion, with its consequent prosperity for all segments of the population. Nevertheless, in spite of some \$200,000,000,000 of liquid savings available for investment, only a small portion is used to purchase equity securities. In the popular mind, common stocks, especially of lesser-known enterprises, are often associated with speculative risk, and, indeed, as

to those companies which are operated behind a veil of nondisclosure, the gambling instinct may be the only impelling force toward equity investment.

But we cannot finance our economy with the equity capital it needs by appeals to the gambler's instinct. It seems to me as plain as a pikestaff that such capital will not be supplied unless there are reasonable assurances that the persons who furnish the money will be kept informed as to its use. Yet, at present, under certain circumstances, management may, and in many instances does, ignore its stewardship obligation to render a true account of the business, and it thereby closes off one of the most important means of stimulating interest in the development of the business—publicity. Except when stockholders resort to expensive litigation, management's freedom to follow purely selfish impulses is largely unrestricted when the company's securities do not happen to be subject to the Securities Exchange Act, the Public Utility Holding Company Act, or the Investment Company Act. S. 2408 is designed to provide the assurances necessary to keep open the pools of public capital.

It is not without significance that the 1949 survey of consumer finances sponsored by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System disclosed that the most important deterrent to investment in common stocks is a lack of familiarity. Familiarity may be achieved only by open and free disclosures of the important factors affecting financial health. Distrust and reluctance to invest breed in an atmosphere of secrecy. S. 2408 is designed to remove these barriers between the investor and his corporation.

Even among experienced, sophisticated financial advisers and analysts there appears to be a reluctance to commit large sums to the care of corporate management which does not make the minimum complete disclosures I have mentioned. I recently saw a compilation of the common stocks held by investment companies. The 50 favorite stocks, which represented 36 percent of their entire common stock portfolio, were all stocks of companies subject to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act. Of course, a large portion of the remaining portfolio also consisted of the stocks of registered companies, leaving a relatively minor fraction of holdings of unregistered securities. The testimony of the representatives of the National Association of Investment Companies in support of S. 2408, the former Governor of Maine, Mr. William T. Gardiner, appears to confirm my observation.

Of interest in this connection is the report prepared by the Trust Investment Study Committee of the New York Bankers Association. This study was begun in 1946 and completed in 1949. It recommended legislation, which has since been adopted by the New York Legislature, for the revision of the list of securities in which trust companies might place the funds committed to their care to include bonds and stocks listed for trading upon an exchange registered with the Securities and Exchange Commis-

sion as a national securities exchange. The report states, in part:

We do require, however, that all bonds other than railroad bonds, which are exempt from the registration provisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission because their issuance must be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, must be obligations which have registered securities with the SEC. The reason for this provision is not that registration with the SEC guarantees quality, but that it does insure the availability and release of adequate information.

I believe that all responsible trustees of other people's money must agree with the basic aims of the legislation. There may be some differences of opinion concerning the scope of the bill and its precise language—these I intend to adjust where necessary—but I have heard no attempt to justify the random character and unequal application of the present laws. If it is in the public interest to require corporations to inform their security holders about such matters as their present financial condition, the background of the persons proposed by management as directors, and the trading in securities of the corporation by management, it seems to me that this information should also be required with respect to large publicly held corporations not so listed.

I have been heartened by the extent and character of support for the bill. The financial community, which presumably knows the problems of investors, has given its almost unanimous approval. Organizations such as the Investment Bankers Association, the National Association of Securities Dealers, the National Securities Traders Association, the New York Society of Corporate Analysts, the National Association of Investment Companies, the New York Stock Exchange, and the New York Curb Exchange sent representatives to testify in favor of the bill. When organizations of this character—conservative, respected members of every community—agree that legislation suggested by a bipartisan Commission of the Federal Government is essential, it seems obvious there must be compelling reasons for the enactment of the legislation.

I think it is a remarkable thing when the leaders of an industry agree with the agency which the Congress has created in that field as to the merits of a legislative proposal. It reflects favorably on both Government and industry, and such a spirit of cooperative give-and-take should be encouraged by the Congress. Of course, opposition was expressed; I would not be fairly describing our committee hearings unless I disclosed that fact. But I can fairly say that the opposition was based predominantly on misunderstanding of the bill and of its provisions for exempting companies and transactions not within its purposes. I have tried to make it crystal clear to all concerned and I reiterate, that it is not the purpose of the bill to restrict business; everyone who foresees any problem in compliance is urged to make his problem known. I want this to be a truly representative and fairly operating piece of legislation. Such opposition arguments as were voiced were

presented relatively in the main by management. Security holders were almost unanimous in their support. Thus, at the time security holders clamored for legislative assistance in their attempts to obtain adequate disclosure, some management opposed such legislation and sought to protect their ability to keep operations secret. This very divergence in viewpoints seems to me to illustrate the need for the legislation.

The detailed studies completed by the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1946 and 1950 force the conclusion that this bill is timely and necessary. I will not itemize the findings contained in those studies, for copies of the reports themselves are readily available. I should like to emphasize that these studies represent an analysis of typical unregistered corporations. There may be some which follow better practices. And I am sure there are many in which management is even less sensitive to their fiduciary obligations; for only corporations making some financial material available to their security holders were examined. Those which did not even respond to a request for copies of their financial statements could not be studied. Moreover, the Commission was able to obtain access only to a limited amount of proxy material. Though seriously deficient, this material probably represents a better than average selection.

Approximately one out of every six of the companies examined failed to furnish its stockholders with one or more of the three basic financial statements necessary for even a rudimentary analysis of the state of the business. These are a balance sheet, profit and loss statement, and statement of surplus. Many companies so handled their reserves that it was impossible to determine, even with a balance sheet, the company's net worth. For example, one company with assets of over six and a half million dollars had a reserve for contingencies of two million, two hundred thousand dollars and did not mention any specific contingency for which provision was made. Let me make it clear that these do not represent cavils about fine points of accounting practice. Not only do such practices result in depriving the owners of the business of essential information about their company, but they create opportunities for concealed manipulation of security holders' right and they deter investors from risking their capital by making investment in such companies a blind adventure.

The proxy soliciting practices of these companies also represented, in most instances, an insensitivity to the rights of the owners of the enterprise. There was a minimum of disclosure and a maximum request for blanket authority. The typical notice for the election of directors did not give even the names of the directors in office or those proposed for the ensuing term. One of the items of business in one-third of the stockholder meetings was the approval and ratification of all acts of management since the preceding meeting but the nature of these acts was in no instance disclosed—a procedure tantamount to a fiduciary's

request for a blank check to cover his past and undisclosed withdrawals.

The typical proxy form had provision for only a "yes" vote upon matters to be decided at the meeting. I should like to quote from an article by Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American, which appeared on May 3, 1949:

On May 10 stockholders of the Camden Forge Co. will be asked to approve an amendment to the concern's certificate of incorporation, changing the tenure of office of directors from 1 to 3 years with only one-third of the board to be elected each year.

Unlike the Montgomery Ward & Co. charter, which permits such change by majority action of directors, it is necessary for two-thirds of the Camden Forge stockholders to approve before this backward step can be taken.

It is unthinkable that stockholders will ratify the proposal. One businessman, in sending in his proxy against the plan, described it as "an undemocratic corporate subterfuge to perpetuate management in office."

In this particular instance, the management, with arrogant disregard of fair treatment of stockholders, makes no provision on the proxy for a negative vote.

Under normal circumstances the Securities and Exchange Commission would prevent such a one-sided presentation, but inasmuch as Camden Forge stock is not listed on a registered securities exchange the SEC lacks jurisdiction over its proxy solicitation.

Undemocratic corporate managements, intent upon concentrating more and more power in their own hands, serve to weaken the American system of private enterprise.

(At this point Mr. FREAR yielded to Mr. FERGUSON, who, by unanimous consent, addressed the Senate in regard to a statement previously made by Mr. MALONE in regard to Mr. Paul Hoffman. Mr. FERGUSON's remarks, together with subsequent remarks by Mr. MALONE, appear in the RECORD following Mr. FREAR's speech.)

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, surely it must be agreed that the proxy practices disclosed by the SEC study are repugnant to our democratic tradition. If that were all to be concerned about, it would be enough. But it is another fact that underlies the failure of many of our corporations to afford an opportunity of participation in the enterprise by those who have the legal right to participate and have been and may be again called upon to risk their funds in the venture.

I have not thus far discussed corporate practices which depart from the business norm. The abuses I have mentioned, startling to me, are common. None of them can exist in those companies now subject to the Securities Exchange Act. S. 2408 is designed to eliminate such practices in other large companies with publicly held securities.

In addition, S. 2408 attempts to outlaw trading by insiders upon inside information. This is closely related to the other provisions, for by withholding accurate information the insider may take advantage of information unavailable to the public generally to trade for his own benefit. Numerous examples of such trading were called to my attention. In one instance where the security was registered on the New York Stock Exchange and the insider was therefore subject to the Securities Exchange Act,

the minority stockholders compelled the insider to return almost a half-million dollars of profit made as a result of such short-term trading. In another instance, involving an unregistered security, I am informed that insiders made a three and one-half million dollar profit in 2 months. All the profit in such trading, of course, was at the expense of the security holders. There is no reason why this basic fiduciary obligation to avoid profiteering from inside information should be imposed only upon officers, directors, and 10-percent stockholders of registered companies. I believe the prohibition against such shocking conduct should apply to all large publicly held companies.

I have listened to all of the testimony upon S. 2408. I have made an exhaustive inquiry into the need for such legislation, and I have had a voluminous correspondence upon it which I have studied carefully. I have found no sound argument against enactment of the bill. As I have mentioned, such opposition as appeared arose largely from misunderstanding. For instance, one company expressed the view that the bill, if passed, would require it to list its stock. No such requirement is in the bill and none is proposed. On the contrary, the bill seeks to maintain a balance between the exchange markets and the over-the-counter markets so that neither one will have an unfair advantage over the other—and the acid test of this is that the representatives of both markets appeared and testified in favor of the principles of the bill. Another objection was voiced on the ground that the SEC would invade the intrastate field after the bill was passed. This objection ignores specific language in the bill permitting exemptions to those companies of an intrastate character.

In part, opposition to the bill was expressed as a vague fear of Government regulation. No one believes more than I do that bureaucracy in government should be discouraged. But I believe that these fears in relation to S. 2408 are unfounded and result from misconceptions and faulty analysis.

S. 2408 is not a new experiment in Government control of regulation. It neither controls nor regulates and its provisions are not new. Enterprise remains free and unrestricted under it. Stripped of its legal terminology, S. 2408 simply instructs corporate fiduciaries to inform their security holders of what the corporation is doing, and to pay profits made from short-term trading in their company's securities to the company. No less should be tolerated by our society. No more is contained in the bill. To call the administration of such a bill "regulation" is, in a sense, a misnomer. For the bill gives no power or authority to impose governmental will on any aspect whatever of management's business discretion.

Nor is the suggestion contained in the bill new. As early as the year 1847 the Connecticut Bank Commissioners recommended to the State assembly that a law be passed inhibiting the power of management over proxies and restricting the authority (of insiders) to trade and speculate in the stocks of their bank; the precise value of which stock, their pe-

culiar means of knowledge gives them the exclusive power of determining. As early as 1858 a British court held criminally liable directors of a British bank who published a false balance sheet, paid dividends when no profits were made, and purchased bank shares with bank money to keep up the price.

Many corporations, although not now subject to the disclosure requirements of the present law, have voluntarily embraced the principles of S. 2408. I believe this represents the predominant attitude of responsible management, which recognizes the enormous benefits which flow from full disclosure. The trend in this direction is expressed in the May 29, 1950, issue of the Investment Digest under the column March of the Markets, as follows:

This trend toward complete disclosure is not the result of SEC or compulsion of any sort. It's simply becoming evident to a greater number of wide-awake businessmen that it pays.

The vice president of one of our great business enterprises recently sent a questionnaire to a group whose business it was to analyze investments, inquiring: "What was the most important thing management could do to mold the investors' attitude in favor of a company?" He summarized the answers in two words. These words were "Full disclosure."

If S. 2408, which is essentially a full disclosure bill, is enacted, I predict financing will be both cheaper and simpler. This was plainly indicated by the testimony of the securities industry, which has the job of underwriting and selling corporate stocks and bonds. Underwriters' costs, by far the largest factor in the cost of selling any new issue, are directly related to the ease with which an anticipated issue of securities may be sold, and publicity of the accounts of a well-managed business is one of the best methods of creating acceptance for its securities. Financial scandals, which cast their reflection upon corporate enterprise, will be reduced.

The specific objections to S. 2408 which I have heard are the same as those voiced in the hearings upon the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. They were rejected then and were rejected by succeeding Congresses when provisions comparable to the financial reporting, proxy-soliciting, and insider-trading requirements of the Securities Exchange Act were incorporated in the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 and the Investment Company Act of 1940. The Investment Company Act, it should be noted, was passed by the Congress without a dissenting vote. I believe that action sufficiently testifies to the bipartisan, noncontroversial character of the corporate reforms proposed by this bill.

It has been contended by those opposed to the bill that there exists, in almost all States, a statutory or common-law right to inspect the corporate books. From this it is argued that there is no need for the proposed legislation. Apart from the fact that the several States have varying restrictions on the right of inspection, it seems to me to be completely unrealistic to tell a stockholder in California that he may hire

an accountant and a lawyer to compel the examination of the books of a New York corporation. This procedure not only effectively deprives the average investor, with limited financial means, of his legal rights, but it often results in such interminable delay that the knowledge of the company's condition, even when obtained, is out of date. The illusory character of this right is well illustrated by the recent litigation in which minority stockholders of an important steel company attempted to obtain a list of the other stockholders so that they might circularize them in opposition to the management.

Although ultimately the Ohio Court of Appeals sustained their right to this list, it was already an old list when they acquired it, and to obtain a current list it would have been necessary to institute a new action. A new action, similarly contested, might have meant more delay, which in turn would have made the new list out-of-date. That is the dilemma into which a stockholder may be forced today. By contrast, the proxy requirements of the SEC today provide opportunity for stockholders to make their proposals and views known to each other through reasonable use of the proxy machinery. Further, information filed with the Commission is immediately available to security holders directly and through advisory services, unless, as I shall mention, there is reason for treating the information as confidential. No State has any legislation remotely comparable to the proxy and insider-trading provisions of the Securities Exchange Act, which now apply to listed securities only.

It is also argued that certain companies whose competitors do not come within the size standards of the act will thus suffer a competitive disadvantage. The desire on the part of corporate management not to disclose what it regards as its own affairs is understandable. However, the state of the business is not management's affair alone. It is inherent in the duties of management stewardship to account to and deal fairly with investors in the enterprise. Sixteen years of experience under the 1934 act demonstrate conclusively, I believe, that the Congress has struck a proper balance. There is absolutely no indication that companies at present registered suffer competitively as a result of their registration. Where information required by the act should be secret or confidential, the Commission may make such information public only when a disclosure of such information is in the public interest. And if the Commission determines that such information should not be kept confidential, the company may appeal to the courts and, if successful in the appeal, prevent any public disclosure. In the 16 years of the Commission's history, only one such appeal was ever taken, and in that case the Commission's view was sustained.

I have examined carefully and in considerable detail the rules and regulations of the Commission which have been in operation for many years in an effort to determine whether the requirements imposed by these rules and regulations are onerous. The Commission is engaged in a continuous process of simplifications, and has always been amena-

ble to reasonable suggestions for modification of any requirement that may impose unnecessary expense or inconvenience. I am convinced that there is no hardship upon companies compelled to file the required reports. There are three types of filings required. First, there are the financial statements filed upon registration and annually thereafter. All of the information contained in these statements is readily available from the accounts which corporations of any size keep in connection with the data at present required by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The average annual report contains only the basic financial information. Where possible, I have suggested further simplification and I am pleased to note the continuing progress in that direction made by the Commission. The second type of filing is that required whenever proxies are solicited. This averages approximately four pages in length and contains simple and relevant information about the meeting. A third type of filing does not relate to the corporation at all; it consists simply of a blank which each insider who buys or sells his corporation's securities must fill in. It is a one-page affair with a half-dozen blank spaces. Contentions that these requirements are onerous are unfounded.

It has been said that this bill will be a burden to small business. Nothing could be further from the truth. All of my inquiries have confirmed my belief that S. 2408 can have no harmful effect upon the small enterprise. The size limits were deliberately established to avoid any possibility that any but the largest concerns would be included. It has been estimated that the 1,800 corporations with \$3,000,000 in assets and 300 security holders form about one-half of one percent of the 4,000,000 business enterprises in this country. It is sheer invention to say, as one organization says, that legislation affecting so minute a proportion of the largest businesses in the country affects small business in any way. In a recent impartial study of various mediums by which business enterprises are considered "large" or "small," such as total assets, tangible net worth, annual sales, number of employees, value of product, and income, it was concluded that small business enterprises having a tangible net worth of \$10,000 or less constitute 80 percent of the businesses in the country. While I would not subscribe to so extreme a limitation in defining the line between big and small business, it throws considerable shadow on the testimony offered by one witness in connection with this bill who contended that a business with \$50,000,000 of assets was "small" business.

S. 2408 is, in a sense, a helping hand in what has appeared to be an irresistible trend toward publicity in corporate affairs. It is a trend which has characterized our emergence as the world's richest storehouse of private economic potential.

The revolution in lending technique predicated upon the borrower's giving a current balance sheet and other financial information was, to quote Roy A. Foulke, vice president of Dun & Bradstreet, "the most radical change in banking practice since the organization of

the Bank of North America in 1781. Nothing could have been more simple, more logical, or more eventful." As with most innovations, businessmen were both resentful and skeptical of the new requirements for giving information before they could obtain money.

By 1900, the new procedure was well on its way toward providing the bond which cemented lenders and businessmen into a mutually profitable relationship. "An itemized statement," said banker James B. Cannon, "provided it is correct, is to a banker what a map is to a traveler, it points out and makes clear things and conditions that would otherwise be obscure and mysterious." The skepticism which greeted the new principle was followed by toleration, and toleration by extension of the practices. Passage of the Income Tax Act in 1913 and of the Excess Profits Tax Act in 1917 compelled businessmen to accept the necessity of a correct system of accounting. In the meantime, the accounting profession achieved recognition, although as late as 1907 investigation by public accountants were made secretly, often at night or on Sunday.

Today no bank or other lending institution would think of providing money for a corporate enterprise without a financial statement accurately disclosing the condition of the business. I believe every investor is also entitled to such information. Common stocks today have emerged to a point where they can and should be sold only on their own merits. I believe we have arrived at that point in the historical trend where resistance to adequate disclosures to stockholders is crumbling in the same way that resistance to making disclosures to creditor crumbled some 50 years ago. The die-hards will continue to object and attempt to obstruct progress, only to find themselves ultimately in a hopeless minority. No one can contemplate the great drive toward full and accurate publicity in financial matters down through the years without realizing that the movement is still in full swing. Without S. 2408 the pockets of resistance will remain, to the damage of investors and of the economy generally. Without S. 2408 progress will be marked, as it has always been, by drastic and expensive suits against recalcitrant managements, upsetting normal business and providing a playground for litigants and speculators. I am proud of the part which I hope to share with the Congress in the movement to bring knowledge of corporate affairs to their owners and to widen the securities markets to include additional corporations in search of new capital.

POSITION OF MR. PAUL HOFFMAN IN REGARD TO PROTECTIVE TARIFFS

During the delivery of Mr. FREAR's speech,

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment? Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish the Senator from Nevada (Mr. MALONE) would give me his attention for a moment. I should like to discuss a matter briefly, with the understanding that the Senator from Delaware will not thereby lose his right to the floor. I ask unanimous consent

that the Senator from Delaware will not lose the floor in this connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on yesterday, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 15021, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] made a statement in reference to the philosophy of Mr. Paul Hoffman. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that point, where the statement of the Senator from Nevada is recorded:

I recall that Mr. Hoffman used to be the head of a great automobile corporation. I also recall that he was quoted in newspapers quite liberally sometime last year in which he said that we should import everything except automobiles—free trade on everything but automobiles.

I simply wish to say that my opinion in regard to that matter is that the statement there appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to what Mr. Hoffman's philosophy is on such matters is not a correct statement of what I understand Mr. Hoffman's philosophy to be. It is a fact that Mr. Hoffman was the head of the Studebaker Corp.; but in my opinion he has never expressed himself as being in favor of a tariff on automobiles. I do not believe such a statement has appeared, unless it was a misquotation in some newspaper or magazine article.

I have discussed this matter in the Appropriations Committee and at various other times with Mr. Hoffman, and he has always expressed himself, because of the knowledge he has of the automobile industry, as believing that there should be no tariff on automobiles—which is just the reverse of what is indicated in the statement I have read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as attributed to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, if it is understood that he will not thereby lose the floor?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the newspaper articles to which I referred in the course of the discussion yesterday appeared a considerable time ago.

Mr. Hoffman is so well known as favoring free trade in regard to virtually every other product, and is so well known as an automobile salesman, that at this moment I am not sure whether the quotation of his remarks which appeared in the newspapers was to the effect which has been stated, namely, that he was in favor of free trade for everything but automobiles. I do not know at the moment whether I can find the newspaper clipping, and I am uncertain whether he said he was in favor of free trade for everything other than automobiles.

However, the point I wished to make at that time was that he has been insisting that we should import on a free-trade basis practically every product, such as butter, minerals, textiles, almost every known product—knowing full well that it would be 3 or 4 years before foreign countries would be in a position to build up automobile industries which would be able to compete with the United States

automobile industry, and that in the meantime it would be possible for shipments of machinery to be made from the United States to such foreign countries and for trained workmen to be established in such foreign countries, so that American automobile corporations could establish branches in those countries and could manufacture automobiles there—and, similarly, for such steps to be taken in regard to the manufacture of typewriters, heavy machinery, and so forth—and in that way take care of the possibility of competition from foreign industries.

Now that the matter has been brought to my attention, I am not certain that Mr. Hoffman said he was in favor of free trade for everything except automobiles; but certainly he has made it clear that he favored free trade, knowing full well that the automobile industry could hold its own several years longer, until it was possible for sufficient shipments of automobile-manufacturing machinery to be made to foreign countries, so that the Ford Co. and General Motors and other automobile companies could have branches well established in such foreign countries, to the end that they could import automobiles to the United States and could compete with foreign companies in the production of automobiles and the importation of automobiles into the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, having talked on quite a number of occasions with Mr. Hoffman, the reason why I feel qualified to speak in regard to this matter is that the statement attributed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would appear to place Mr. Hoffman in the position of favoring free trade in the case of all American industries except the automobile industry, in which Mr. Hoffman is interested; and the Senator's statement would appear to indicate that Mr. Hoffman favors and desires to have tariff protection in the case of the American automobile industry.

To the contrary, I have heard Mr. Hoffman state that he favors a tariff in the case of all industries except the automobile industry; and in regard to the automobile industry, he has said he did not favor having a tariff imposed.

Mr. MALONE. I have watched the newspapers particularly in regard to statements by Mr. Hoffman, because generally I violently disagree with the statements he makes. I have not yet seen statements credited to him as favoring a discontinuance of the 10-percent tariff on automobiles.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have heard Mr. Hoffman state on various occasions that he is in favor of having the tariff on automobiles discontinued.

Mr. MALONE. If that is Mr. Hoffman's position, I think he is correct.

As the Senator from Michigan has said, I think there are only a small number of industries in the United States which would not be ruined almost immediately by having the tariff removed. Perhaps the heavy-machinery industry and the automobile and truck industry were included in that category.

At this time I ask the Senator from Michigan if he has ever seen a public statement by Mr. Hoffman asking for a

removal of the 10-percent tariff on automobiles.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think I have ever seen such a statement made by Mr. Hoffman publicly; nor do I know of such a statement by him, other than in the Senate Appropriations Committee and in personal conversations with me.

Mr. MALONE. But never published publicly?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Delaware in permitting this interruption, and I ask that the colloquy be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, under the same order to have this colloquy appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; if the further interruption will not be lengthy.

Mr. MALONE. It will not be, I assure the Senator.

Mr. President, I believe it would be very interesting, in spite of what the junior Senator from Michigan already has said about Mr. Hoffman, for the Senate to know that in April or May, 1949, Mr. Hoffman wrote a magazine article which is very clear, and does not leave very much to the imagination. I shall read only one paragraph of the article, because I know the distinguished Senator from Delaware is anxious to conclude his remarks. Otherwise, I would make these remarks of mine rather extended.

So at this time I shall read only a portion of the article, to support what I have already said, namely, that Mr. Hoffman is a free-trader on every product which has come to my notice, and that free trade would result in the ruin of virtually all American industries, some in 60 days, and some in a year.

I quote now from the article by Mr. Hoffman:

Secondly, we must go out of our way consciously to encourage imports from Europe. We must, in certain instances, be ready to reduce tariffs to make it possible for them to trade with us.

Nothing is said in that statement about the differential of cost due to the difference in wages or the difference in standards of living or any other differences in regard to which a differential should be provided for, in order to protect the workingmen and the investors of the United States.

I read further from the article:

The Danes, for example, would like to send us more of their good butter in exchange for United States goods; but an inordinate tariff of 14 cents a pound prevents them from doing so.

Mr. President, at one of the famous conferences held by the State Department on foreign soil, the tariff on butter was cut following the publication of that article. As I said at the time, in other words, we are to reduce our tariffs on the products coming from Europe; and, I may say, in almost every instance, we already have cut import fees or tariffs

below the critical point which makes up the differential between the cost of production of an item in the United States and the cost of its production in Europe, due mostly to the difference in wages and the difference in standards of living, because the Europeans now have access to and are receiving our best, most up-to-date machinery, in each particular industry. Our technical know-how goes with the machinery.

In other words, I assume that the butter-producing States of the United States would be very happy to know that Mr. Hoffman advocated that the tariff be cut from 14 cents a pound to 7 cents a pound, and that the tariff was reduced, and as a result we have today in warehouses in the United States 190,000,000 pounds of butter, and we are piling up butter at the rate of 15,000,000 pounds each month.

I am very happy to have this matter come up, Mr. President, so that it can be clarified, and so that the entire attitude of ECA, as represented by Administrator Hoffman, may be spread on the Record.

FOREIGN TEACHER EXCHANGE PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2028) to permit the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in the foreign teacher exchange program in cooperation with the United States Office of Education, which was, on page 2, line 5, after "effected" insert ": *Provided*, That in any one calendar year not more than ten such employees shall participate in such program".

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Senate bill 2028 was recently passed by the Senate. The purpose of the bill was to permit the teachers of the public schools in the District of Columbia to participate in the foreign teachers exchange program. When the original bill was passed setting up this program, it applied to all the States, but the District of Columbia was inadvertently omitted. The purpose of the bill was to permit the District of Columbia teachers to participate in the program. The bill passed the Senate, and then went to the House. The House added an amendment, which provided that in any one calendar year not more than 10 of the teachers should participate in such program. The bill is now on the Secretary's desk, with that amendment. The amendment has the approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, this is a Senate bill which had been modified through an amendment by the House. The bill originally passed the Senate on the Consent Calendar, as I recall. The adoption of the amendment referred to by the Senator from Rhode Island would place a ceiling on the number of teachers in the District of Columbia who could be placed

on exchange with other countries. Is that correct?

Mr. LEAHY. That is, in any one year.

Mr. WHERRY. As the bill left the Senate, there was no ceiling on it at all; is that correct?

Mr. LEAHY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And as I understand, the ceiling now is 10 teachers for the District of Columbia; is that correct?

Mr. LEAHY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask that this matter be placed at the end of my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this be placed at the end of the remarks by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LEAHY. I join in that request.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECEIPT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES WHILE DRAWING PENSION, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1507) to amend section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946, relating to the receipt of pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, and for other purposes, which was, on page 3, line 10, after "1947", insert ", and shall terminate five years after the date of approval of this act."

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky what the House amendment does? What is its implications?

Mr. CHAPMAN. The bill admits to the payment of disability benefits former personnel of the armed services who are still serving in civilian components of the armed services.

Mr. WHERRY. I take it that was not contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN. It was in the Senate bill, but the House amendment imposes a 5-year limitation on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The House amendment places a ceiling in the way of a 5-year limitation on the life of the proposed act. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAPMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, this matter will be placed at the end of the remarks of the Senator from Delaware.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE AS A VITAL DEFENSE RESOURCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the Record at this point an address which I had intended to make to the Senate this evening. It deals with our merchant-shipping interests. I know the Presiding Officer would have been very much interested in listening to the address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. President, I am confident that every Member of the Senate regards our American merchant marine as a vital defense resource, particularly at this time, when United States troops are fighting against tremendous odds to hold the line in Korea and when the country in addition faces a grave international crisis.

The transportation of armament and supplies across the Pacific to those brave men of our armed services is entirely dependent upon our merchant ships and tankers. Every Member of the Senate knows this. Every Member of this body knows also that we could not have won World War II without our merchant marine.

It will seem fantastic to you and to every other American citizen, therefore, to be informed that a proposal has been made, at this critical time in our history, to shrink our merchant marine for the benefit of some of our foreign competitors.

I cannot think of a more perilous policy to launch at this time. But I have in my possession the evidence that this serious threat to our national security is being proposed. It is unbelievable that such a policy would even be considered by agencies of our own Government, normally entrusted with policy matters dealing with the merchant marine.

As chairman of the Senate committee dealing with merchant marine legislation, I wish to serve notice that our committee will be alert and will act to block any attempt by anybody to cripple such a vital industry as our merchant marine.

This plan to curtail drastically the operations of our commercial fleets is disguised in recommendations designed to help western Europe improve its dollar reserves. To accomplish this the plan recommends:

1. Foreign ships should be allowed to enter the United States coastwise and intercoastal and noncontiguous trades.

2. There should be a gradual reduction and eventual elimination of all ship operating subsidies.

3. Congressional enactments, requiring that 50 percent of all Marshall plan shipments move in American vessels, should be repealed.

4. One hundred dry cargo vessels and tankers should be transferred from American to foreign flags.

Let us analyze briefly these astounding proposals. Neither this or any other nation would ever allow foreign ships to enter in direct competition with its own vessels in home waters. For the United States to do so would be disastrous to its own domestic shipping whose operating costs and wages are far higher. Our ships would be laid up and our merchant seamen thrown out of their jobs.

Reduction and eventual elimination of operating subsidies, which mean merely the parity of competitive opportunity with cheap labor foreign lines, would wipe out a substantial proportion of our overseas shipping.

The repeal of laws requiring that 50 percent of all Marshall plan shipments move in

American vessels would repudiate a sound congressional mandate. This mandate simply means that it is only fair that American-flag ships get an even break with foreign ships in the transportation of these cargoes, which were almost entirely financed by congressional appropriations already amounting to billions of dollars.

The transfer of 100 American dry cargo vessels and tankers to foreign flags would be fantastic at any time but particularly at the present time. We may desperately need every vessel we have at any moment. Congress was wise enough to reject a similar proposal 2 years ago.

My purpose is thus exposing to you the disastrous effects of such proposals is to put the Congress on guard as to their danger. I know that they have actually been drawn up for incorporation in a general plan to bridge over the so-called dollar gap for western European nations. I strongly share in the belief that we should continue to do everything within reason that would strengthen any nation aligned with us against the encroachments of Communist expansion. But I say that it is suicide to do this at the expense of one of our vital war industries. Our merchant marine is part of our first line of defense. Any attempt to curtail its operations is as dangerous as an attempt to shrink our Air Force, Army, or Navy.

Unless the proponents of this fantastic and dangerous proposal withdraw it altogether, I am determined to propose for the consideration of the Senate a resolution to investigate the whole plan and the individuals motivating it.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. For a moment; yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been hoping to be able today to make a motion to proceed to the consideration of the Alaska statehood bill. It had been assumed, when the measure dealing with the railroad unions was made a part of agenda of the Senate, that there had been complete agreement upon it, and that it would pass without a great deal of delay. It is not altogether clear that that is going to be the situation now.

I think it is not clear as yet how much time will be consumed in action upon the conference report on the slot-machine bill. That may take a little time or a great deal of time. But I am very definite in my feeling that this session of Congress should not adjourn without taking action upon the statehood bill. The railroad bill is a Senate measure which has not yet been passed by the House. The statehood bills are both measures which have been passed by the House, and for which there is a substantial majority in the Senate.

As I pointed out yesterday, the United Nations Assembly gathered today. There are a dozen Asiatic countries represented in the United Nations Assembly, and, as I stated yesterday, the United States of America is battling now to capture the minds of mankind, and particularly the minds of the people of Asia, by convincing them that we are not exponents of colonial imperialism, but stand for democracy and self-government.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want the RECORD to show clearly that in asking that the railroad bill be made the unfinished business I was in accord with the program adopted by the Democratic Policy Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. McFARLAND. And that was understood by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. And it was agreeable to him that I should make the motion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. There is no criticism intended of anybody. The policy committee adopted an agenda. That agenda contained all the measures which the acting majority leader has brought before the Senate since the calendar was called. But it also included the statehood bills.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that. I merely wanted to make it plain that no effort is being made to push those bills back.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that. The Senator from Arizona has been most cooperative; but we must be realistic, and meet the facts as they arise.

Tomorrow the House of Representatives will begin to vote upon certain conference reports. There will be the conference report upon the appropriation bill, and then in due course there will be the conference report upon the tax bill, and when those two reports are out of the way, and the antisubversive bill is out of the way, there will be a strong movement to bring this session to a termination.

There has been no decision, so far as I have been able to ascertain, as to whether that termination will be by adjournment or recess. My own personal belief is that it ought to be by recess and not by adjournment, because no man living can predict now what vital defense problems Congress may have to deal with during November and December. The legislative representatives of the people of the United States should not be out of session in this great crisis. We certainly should not run the risk of not having action by the Senate upon the statehood bills which have passed the House of Representatives by overwhelming votes.

Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of advising the Senate last week I wrote once more to the State Department and to the Department of National Defense to ask them whether developments in the Pacific Ocean had in any way changed their attitude toward the statehood bills. Early in the year the Department of State, by a letter dated April 20, 1950, recommended the enactment of the statehood bills. Previously, by a letter dated April 18, signed by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, the Department of Defense also recommended passage of these bills.

These recommendations have now been renewed by letters dated September 15 and September 19. In both these letters, the letter of September 15 and that of September 19, it is stated that developments in the Pacific make statehood more imperative than ever before. There can be no doubt about it.

Mr. President, this afternoon I dictated a brief release to accompany these letters just received from the Department of State and the Department of Defense, and I ask unanimous consent that this release, with the letters, may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE AND DEFENSE DEPARTMENTS AGAIN URGE STATEHOOD BILLS

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, today issued the following statement:

"State and Defense Departments have today reported to me that the Korean situation and developments in the Pacific have increased the urgency for granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

"Responding to inquiries I made immediately after the Majority Policy Committee had announced that the statehood bills would be taken up this session, both Departments again have urged prompt passage of the measures now before the Senate.

"Assistant Secretary of State Jack K. McFall writes as follows for the Secretary of State:

"The views of the Department as set forth in the letter of April 20, 1950, have not been modified by the development of the Korean conflict. Indeed, the Department believes that the Korean situation has increased the urgency for favorable action on these bills and has rendered more compelling the reasons set forth in my letter of April 20, 1950."

"Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, under date of September 15, writes:

"I have nothing to add to the views I have previously expressed on this subject, other than to say that recent events in the Pacific seem to me to give added point and emphasis to the statements contained in my letter of April 18."

"The significance of the restatement of the desire of the State and Defense Departments for favorable action on the statehood bills is emphasized by the fact that the agenda of the United Nations Assembly, which opened in New York today, carries approximately 73 items concerning Asia and Asiatic problems. It is not too much to say that the Pacific area is the main concern of 59 nations of the world, and that the problems of peace, liberty, and self-government in this portion of the world will occupy the attention the United Nations Assembly for the next several months.

"There are 15 free Asiatic nations represented in the Assembly: Afghanistan, Burma, China, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Philippines, Siam, Saudi-Arabia, Syria, Turkey, and Yemen. All of these will be watching with interest the action of the Congress with respect to statehood. The President repeatedly has recommended statehood; the House of Representatives passed the bills by large majorities; and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs favorably reported the measures with recommendation for their passage; it remains only for the Senate itself to act.

"Casualty lists arriving from the Korean front indicate that favorable action should not be delayed. In that conflict Hawaiian soldiers have taken the brunt of much of the fighting, and the latest casualty list published in the Honolulu Star Bulletin for September 16 (last Saturday) shows 26 dead, 136 wounded, 71 missing, and 1 prisoner of war, a total of 234. The names which appear on the casualty list are proof that the oriental races as represented in Hawaii are fighting for self-government.

"The new letters from the State Department and the Defense Department, together with the original reports, are attached."

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, September 15, 1950.
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Interior and Insular
Affairs Committee,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have just received your letter of September 13 asking me if I would like to express any views with respect to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii in addition to the views which I expressed in my letter of April 18 to you.

I have nothing to add to the views I have previously expressed on this subject, other than to say that recent events in the Pacific seem to me to give added point and emphasis to the statements contained in my letter of April 18.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 19, 1950.
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Interior and Insular
Affairs Committee,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is in reply to your letter of September 12, 1950, regarding the Department of State's views on bills for admission of Hawaii and Alaska into the Union, and inquiring whether recent events in Korea have in any way caused the Department's views to be changed.

The views of the Department as set forth in the letter of April 20, 1950, have not been modified by the development of the Korean conflict. Indeed, the Department believes that the Korean situation has increased the urgency for favorable action on these bills and has rendered more compelling the reasons set forth in my letter of April 20, 1950.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 18, 1950.
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This letter is further in response to your communication of March 30, 1950, in which you make reference to two bills, H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, which, if enacted, would admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, into the Federal Union as States. Because I understand that your committee intends on April 24 to commence hearings on H. R. 331, which concerns Alaska, and to hold hearings beginning May 1 on H. R. 49, the Hawaiian proposal, I address this letter to you for the purpose of expressing the concurrence of the Department of Defense in both proposals.

As you know, the administration has repeatedly expressed itself as favoring Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood and both proposals have again and again been introduced by the President. On January 4, in his State of the Union message, President Truman urged that the Congress during 1950 "grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii." The enactment of H. R. 49 and H. R. 331 would, I believe, effectively accomplish this objective.

You asked in your letter of March 30 as to whether from the point of view of national defense, it would be advantageous to extend statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, and you inquired specifically as to whether statehood would give greater strength to our military position in those areas than does the present Territorial type of local govern-

ment. It is obvious that the more stable a local government can be, the more successful would be the control and defense of the area in case of sudden attack. There can be no question but that in the event of an attack any State would be immensely aided in the initial stages of the emergency by the effective use of the State and local instrumentalities of law and order. By the same token it would seem to me that, as persons in a position to assist the Federal garrisons which might exist in Hawaii or Alaska, the locally elected governors, sheriffs, and the locally selected constabulary and civil defense units all would be of tremendous value in cases of sudden peril. Therefore, my answer to your question is that statehood for Alaska and Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the over-all defense of both areas in event of emergency.

I am not attempting in this letter to endorse the specific language of either of the bills under consideration, but I do wish strongly to support the principle of granting immediate statehood to both the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii as in the best interest of the United States and of all its peoples both here and in the Territories.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, April 20, 1950.
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is to acknowledge your letter of April 7 addressed to Secretary Acheson informing him of the hearings on the Alaska and Hawaiian bills which are scheduled to open on April 24, and May 1, respectively, and inviting the Department to have a qualified officer ready to give the committee factual information and the Department's views on the possible effects of the inclusion of these Territories within the United States.

When similar proposals were before the Senate last year, you were good enough to invite the views of the Department, which were furnished to you in letters dated July 7 and June 29, 1949. The views of the Department remain as then stated. The Department perceives no objection to the provisions of these bills from the standpoint of the foreign policy of the United States and considers that the admission of these Territories to the Union would be in conformity with the traditional policy of the United States toward the peoples of Territories under its administration who have not yet become fully self-governing. It continues to feel that favorable action on these bills by the Congress would be an act in fulfillment of the obligation assumed by the United States in accepting the declaration regarding non-self-governing Territories set out in chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and would thus serve to support American foreign policy and strengthen the position of the United States in international affairs.

With reference to the final paragraph of your letter, the Department is glad to accept your invitation and will have a qualified officer ready to give the committee such factual information as the committee may wish to have, insofar as the Department of State is concerned.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have the floor, and I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I, of course, wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming. I do not think that any action of the Congress could have a greater psychological effect, to our good, upon our problems in the Pacific than granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. We can pass the bills at this session. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Wyoming, because I am strongly in favor of action.

I believe the time has come when we are nearing the end of the session, and I propose to ask the leadership tomorrow on both sides whether or not they intend to bring up the statehood bills at this session. If they say they do not intend to bring the bills up, I certainly hope the Senator from Wyoming, who has done such an admirable job in the hearings on statehood, who feels so keenly about it, then, in all propriety, when the answer is received either "yes" or "no", will move to bring up those measures which the majority of the Senate favor. I hope he will do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator for his statement. I must add that there is no doubt in my mind that statehood is on the agenda. That was the determination of the policy committee. I have no doubt that these bills will be brought up. If it should become necessary for me to make the motion, of course I will make the motion, but I am sure that the agenda of the policy committee of the majority will be carried out, and these bills will be brought up. It would be a tragic thing if they were not brought up, because it would be notice to the United Nations Assembly that we were unwilling to stand by the principles, in action, to which we give allegiance when we talk.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And do for our own people what we ask them to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. We have to make it clear to all the world that we are standing for self-government, and the right of people to be supreme in their own affairs without totalitarian dictatorship of any kind.

In these incorporated territories there are able, free, American citizens who have contributed to the support of the Government, as in the Territory of Hawaii, where the taxes paid are greater than the taxes paid in each one of ten separate States which are already represented upon this floor, and the people who live in Alaska, those who have gone there and the natives, have, in natural resources, one of the most richly endowed Territories of all the world. We cannot refuse to act. National defense calls for action. Plain common sense and justice call for action.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not wish to take too much time—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oregon enjoys this. He is with us.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He is with us in this matter. The importance of what the Senator from Wyoming has said was very strikingly brought out 8 or 9 months ago. The Senator from Wyoming knows there are two small islands in the Bering Sea, the Little Diomed and the Big Dio-

mede Islands. One is Russian territory and the other is United States territory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But they are inhabited by the same tribe or band of Eskimos, natives. Each year the natives from Little Diomed go to Big Diomed, or vice versa, for a sort of tribal get-together.

Last year was the year when the American natives' turn came to go to the Russian island. When they got there they were seized by the Russians and held captive. They were questioned day after day. One of them who had been educated in the States could speak English and understand a little Russian. He escaped and returned, and made a statement of the purport of the Russian questions. The questions were, "What kind of government is there in Alaska? Is it a Territory? Is the Governor appointed from Washington? Are the people self-sustaining? Do they have independence?" Question after question along that line was asked him. The Russians still believe that Alaska belongs to them, that we cheated them out of Alaska. This is preached to the Russian people. They are told that we treat the people of Alaska as colonials.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Soviet Government has declared that the government of the Czar had no right to sell Alaska to the United States of America. They are bringing that up now. It is a part of their propaganda. It is true that the people of Alaska have territorial government. It is true that natives are elected to the Territorial legislature. It is true that under Governor Gruening there has been complete equality and complete recognition of native rights. Nevertheless, the denial of statehood to these people will be made the vehicle of Russian propaganda in the Assembly of the United Nations.

It was my understanding that the opening of the Assembly of the United Nations today was delayed until late this afternoon in order that the Russian representative, Mr. Vishinsky, could arrive before the meeting was opened.

There is not a Senator on this floor who does not know the technique of Mr. Vishinsky. Are we going to put ammunition in his hands for propaganda among the Asiatic nations? Of course we are not.

The trouble is that these Territories are not represented in this body, and therefore every Member of the Senate, with his own problems on his mind, and with national problems on his mind, finds it very easy to put aside the question of Alaska and Hawaii. But the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman is clothed with the responsibility of acting upon these measures. We received the bills when they came from the House. We held hearings on them. We gave the bills close study. We improved the bills; I think there can be no doubt about that. The Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii say that the bills are much more acceptable now than they were in the form in which they came to the Senate. We have done our work in the committee. Yesterday I was happy to find that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] took the floor—he in committee had been unable

to vote for statehood for Alaska though he had voted for statehood for Hawaii—and said he had changed his mind about Alaska and would support statehood for Alaska.

We have the votes, and as chairman of the committee I intend to make certain that the Senate will have the opportunity of considering the bills.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of that statement by the senior Senator from Wyoming, I ask him: Is it now his intention to move at some time before the Senate adjourns or recesses this week—which we have been led to believe would occur—to take up the statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am confident that the majority leader on his return will move that they be taken up. I am confident that the acting majority leader, as soon as the opportunity is presented, will make the motion.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not attempting to secure a commitment. If that is to be the program it will affect the question of adjournment on Saturday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It will.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It will affect it and should affect it.

Mr. WHERRY. I know there are Senators on this side of the aisle who do not want Congress to adjourn—we might as well be honest about that matter—and the statehood bills are the bills to which they want consideration given. I have not been in on the Democratic conference, so I do not know exactly what has been done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That has been an oversight. I spread my arms to welcome the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I will attend the next meeting on that invitation. I wish to say, however, that we have been led to believe that on Saturday night a motion will be made, either that an adjournment sine die be taken, or to adjourn to a day certain. Many Senators are making their plans with the idea that that procedure will be carried out. If it is the intention of the senior Senator from Wyoming to move to take up the statehood bills I will say, knowing the persistence of the Senator from Wyoming, that that means the Senate should not even consider getting out of here on Saturday night of this week.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say, with the indulgence of my good friend from Oregon, that the Senator from Nebraska expressed the opinion that he expected sine die adjournment.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no. I simply stated that if it was proposed to take up the statehood bills that would shelve any sine die adjournment or recess possibly at this time. I am not taking issue with respect to the bills. All I say is that if the Senator from Wyoming is serving notice that he will move to take up the bills, which he has a perfect right to do, there is no use of attempting to adjourn this week, either by sine die adjournment or to a day certain, or in any other way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When do both sides of the House and the Senate expect

to have a conference regarding the method of ending the session?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The only conference we have had was a very informal discussion one day last week. At that time I understood the majority leader to say that when the majority had a program ready respecting adjournment they would submit it to the minority side; that we would be advised of what the majority wanted to do. I am not in any way at this time attempting to say what we should or what we should not do. I simply say that if it is the intention of the Senator from Wyoming to move to take up the statehood bills—and certainly he would make no such move unless he expected to go through with it; he would not merely go through the motions—I should like to know of it as soon as possible. Senators on this side of the aisle have been making plans on the theory that there might be an adjournment or recess taken at the end of this week, and they would then have to change their plans.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me to make a statement?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Senate bill 3295, the Railway Labor Act amendment bill, which is the unfinished business, has been temporarily laid aside for the conference report on the slot-machine bill. The latter is, of course, a privileged matter. Two or three other conference reports will be taken up. It is definitely on the agenda that the statehood bills will follow the disposition of Senate bill 3295.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] a moment ago asked both the majority and the minority what was proposed to be done. Of course, no one knows what the Senate of the United States will do, for it is composed of 96 Senators. If they decide to recess, or decide to adjourn and go home, that decision, of course, will be binding. But it was thought it would not be advisable to try to determine when we would take an adjournment until action on the conference reports had been completed. When action on the conference reports has been completed the determination will be made as to when it will be advisable to adjourn. In the meantime the statehood bills remain on the agenda, following the disposition of Senate bill 3295.

Mr. President, I think the Senate has moved along as fast as it could. The Senate of the United States does not always move as rapidly as some may want it to move, and perhaps more rapidly than others would like to see it move. But it is a democratic body and it is a good one. I do not think we should complain too much about the action of the Senate. I think we are making progress as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for one further suggestion?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In view of the entire situation, if we decide to recess—I do not think we should adjourn sine

die—it might be a very proper thing to make the Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood bills the unfinished business, and then, when we return at the end of the recess, pass the bills. That might be satisfactory to everyone concerned.

Mr. McFARLAND. That will have to be determined in the conference which will be had after the conference reports on the tax bill and the subversive-activities bill are presented.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a few points I desire to cover on a series of subjects. I shall endeavor to be very brief about them.

First, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Washington on the two major points they made. I agree with them that it would be a great mistake for the Senate to adjourn sine die. I think we owe it to the responsibility of our posts and we owe it to the American people to recess to a date certain, subject to immediate call prior to that date in case national exigencies warrant our being brought back.

I believe that to be very important from the standpoint of national morale. In my opinion the American people are deserving of the reassurance that their elected representatives in the Congress of the United States are continuing on the job, even though they may take a recess to a date certain.

Secondly, I join with the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Washington in regard to their emphasis upon the importance of early action on the statehood bills. I am supporting those bills for a great many reasons, but I think the primary one and the sufficient one is that from the standpoint of national security these two Territories should become States. As a member of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, about whose work I shall have something to say in a moment, I wish to say that I am satisfied that the lack of adequate defenses in Alaska and the threat to the security of the Nation because of that condition would never have come to pass if the people of Alaska had been represented in the Senate of the United States by two Senators, and in the House of Representatives by a Representative.

It is simply inconceivable that the elected representatives of the people of Alaska, with the power to vote in the Congress of the United States, would ever have permitted the defenses of Alaska to reach the low point they have reached. We have been forewarned of the situation for some time past. The Congress has not taken the steps which should have been taken. In my judgment, the executive branch of the Government has not taken the steps which should have been taken, to build up the defenses of Alaska.

The situation is so serious that the Military Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services has taken cognizance of it, and this week is sending to Alaska members of its professional staff to start the investigation which the subcommittee has authorized; and three members of the subcommittee will go to Alaska next month for hearings on the ground, after our

staff of experts has done the preliminary work for us in Alaska, making it possible for us to continue with the investigation on the basis of their preliminary findings. I understand that we are to be honored by having with us on that trip also the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who now is presiding over the Senate. On behalf of the committee, I wish to assure him that we shall welcome having him associated with us on the trip, and we shall appreciate having him there because of his great knowledge of Alaskan problems.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE MUNITIONS BOARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what I really arose to discuss very briefly is an article entitled "Howard Quits Post in Munitions Board," which appeared on page 20 in this morning's New York Times. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOWARD QUILTS POST IN MUNITIONS BOARD—
CHAIRMAN RESIGNING PRAISES JOHNSON—
TRUMAN NOMINATES MARSHALL AS DEFENSE
HEAD

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, September 18—President Truman terminated today the services of Hubert E. Howard, chairman of the Munitions Board, who in his letter of resignation referred to Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, as a great administrator. Meanwhile, the Chief Executive legally paved the way to appoint General of the Army George C. Marshall as Mr. Johnson's successor.

The President also signed a law authorizing a five-star rank for Gen. Omar N. Bradley, and then sent a formal nomination to the Senate to confirm the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a General of the Army.

Mr. Truman was brisk in accepting the resignation of Mr. Johnson's partisan, although the amenities were observed in the exchange of letters.

"It is with deepest regret that I have learned of your acceptance of the resignation of Mr. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, a man whom I consider one of the great administrators of the country, and for whom I have the highest personal regard," wrote Mr. Howard.

RECALLS PLEDGE OF YEAR SERVICE

"When I came to Washington last fall at the request of Mr. Johnson, I promised him I would spend a year in Government service. That year has expired 1 September 1950.

"I herewith tender my resignation as chairman of the Munitions Board, Department of Defense, effective at your earliest convenience and, I hope, not later than September 30. I cannot do this without expressing my grateful appreciation of the opportunity you have given me to serve."

Mr. Howard wrote this letter last Wednesday, the day after Mr. Truman forced Mr. Johnson to resign and received from the Secretary of Defense a letter acknowledging that he made more enemies than friends while in that office.

Mr. Truman replied to Mr. Howard as follows:

"Knowing your desire for expeditious action and appreciating the fact that you have completed the year of service which you undertook to perform, I accept, effective at

the close of business today, the resignation which you tendered in your letter of September 13.

HOWARD'S SERVICE IS PRAISED

"Although your letter named September 13 as the effective date for the relinquishment of your post, I am moving up that date in accordance with your further desire orally expressed to be relieved of fulltime duty as soon as possible. I am grateful for your consideration of the public interest by continuing your availability in an advisory capacity until the end of the month.

"Accept, please, my heartfelt thanks for the superior service which you have rendered the Government during a particularly critical period—a service for which your previous experience gave you exceptional knowledge and resources. Your contribution to the national security has been invaluable."

Mr. Howard was named for the board chairmanship last November. Before that he was chairman of the Personnel Policy Board of the Department of Defense. He was a Chicago coal company executive.

On September 7, the Munitions Board was strongly criticized by the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee and reports predicting Mr. Howard's resignation became current on Capitol Hill. The subcommittee which took over the role of the old Truman Senate War Investigating Committee, declared that the Board lowered, rather than raised, the volume of rubber acquisitions for stockpiling.

PRESIDENT APPROVES BILL

The subcommittee also reported that it sought and obtained President Truman's support in halting the sale of a Government-owned rubber plant in Akron, Ohio, and had "prevented the further disposition of other Government property having a wartime use or potential."

Mr. Truman signed this morning the law passed last week that authorized the appointment of General Marshall as Secretary of Defense. Under the National Security (Unification) Act of 1947, professional military officers cannot be appointed to the office unless more than 10 years has elapsed since their last active service. Having cleared away this legal obstacle, Mr. Truman then sent the formal nomination of the general to the Senate for confirmation.

Tomorrow the Senate Armed Services Committee will meet at 2 p. m. to consider the nomination.

After signing the enabling act relating to General Bradley, Mr. Truman sent his nomination for five-star rank to the Senate. When he is confirmed, General Bradley will join the group of war leaders who have received that rank: Generals of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, the late Henry H. Arnold, George C. Marshall and Douglas MacArthur; and Fleet Adms. William D. Leahy, Ernest J. King, Chester W. Nimitz, and William F. Halsey.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call particular attention to the following paragraph or two about which I wish to make special comment:

On September 7, the Munitions Board was strongly criticized by the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee and reports predicting Mr. Howard's resignation became current on Capitol Hill. The subcommittee, which took over the role of the old Truman Senate War Investigating Committee, declared that the board lowered, rather than raised, the volume of rubber acquisitions for stockpiling.

PRESIDENT APPROVES BILL

The subcommittee also reported that it sought and obtained President Truman's support in halting the sale of a Government-owned rubber plant in Akron, Ohio, and had "prevented the further disposition of other Government property having a wartime use or potential."

The comment in regard to the action which the Board took in connection with the particular rubber plant referred to and other surplus-property plants is correct.

It will be remembered that a short time ago I commented on a large and costly advertisement which was published in at least one Washington newspaper—and I do not know how many other newspapers—by the General Tire Co., criticizing a news commentator who in a broadcast raised a serious question in regard to the desirability of selling that rubber plant to the General Tire Co. for the purpose of the manufacture of plastics.

The subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, commonly known as the "watch-dog committee," proceeded to make inquiry not only into the policies of the Munitions Board in regard to this particular matter, which apparently had been sanctioned by the Munitions Board but also into the policies of the Board in connection with surplus-property matters in general, and stockpiling in particular.

The information and evidence which the investigation by the subcommittee brought forth was partly the basis of the first report of the subcommittee, which, as the New York Times article accurately points out, was a report which met with the approval of Mr. Symington, and, through the President's endorsement and sanction of a letter of instructions which Mr. Symington sent out, based upon the report of our subcommittee, it can accurately be said, I think, that the report also met with the approval of the President of the United States.

However, the report did not begin to disclose all the evidence and information which the subcommittee had gathered in regard to the policies of the Munitions Board. There was other evidence which caused many of us to believe that at least a *prima facie* case existed against the efficiency of the Munitions Board in handling its responsibilities and duties prior to the Korean War, and therefore the committee scheduled a hearing, which was to have occurred this morning, at which hearing it was intended to go into the record of the Munitions Board in connection with the entire problem of the defense program and the part which the Board played or did not play in it.

The junior Senator from Oregon announced some days ago, at an earlier hearing of the Board, that it was his intention, when we got into the investigation of the Munitions Board matter, that all the testimony of all the witnesses be taken under oath. In fact, it is the intention of the junior Senator from Oregon from now on to insist upon that procedure. I think it is very important that the committee make perfectly clear that we mean business when it comes to checking into the problems of efficiency and honesty and effectiveness of the Munitions Board in connection with the prosecution of the defense program and the war effort, of which it is a part.

The resignation of the Chairman of the Munitions Board as of last night resulted in a conversation between the general counsel of the Munitions Board

and the chairman of our subcommittee—and I may make clear that if he were on the floor, he would not take exception to anything that I have said in the course of these remarks—on the question as to whether the committee planned or desired to go forward with the hearing this morning. The chairman of the subcommittee reached the decision—and I think rightly, subject to further discussion in the future on the part of members of the committee—that, at least as of now, such a hearing should not be held, but that the staff of the committee should pursue a further and even more thorough inquiry into the policies of the Munitions Board. It would also seem to me fair and proper that we await the appointment of the new Chairman of the Munitions Board before we reach any further official conclusion, at least in the form of a formal report on the part of the subcommittee in respect to the policies of the Munitions Board.

What I would stress now, as a member of the subcommittee, speaking entirely for myself, is that it be recognized by the administration that the position of the Chairman of the Munitions Board should be considered pretty much as that of chief of staff for economic and industrial mobilization, just as we have a Chief of Staff for military mobilization. It is of the utmost importance that the exceedingly responsible position of Chairman of the Munitions Board be carried out by someone who thoroughly understands that the job is that of chief of staff of economic and industrial mobilization.

As one who participated very thoroughly in the preparation and hearings and debate on the so-called unification bill, the junior Senator from Oregon thinks he is in a position to say with some assurance that the Munitions Board features of that law never contemplated that the Chairman of the Munitions Board should be the representative of American industry. It was not devised in order to give industry or any other group a partisan voice in the policies of the Munitions Board, any more than labor or agriculture or any other economic group was intended to have an economic-group voice or representation in the program for economic and industrial mobilization.

It was contemplated that the Chairman of the Munitions Board should be a man of such great stature and ability and experience that he could be counted upon to understand thoroughly the complex problems of American industry and the intricate steps which must be taken in order to mobilize successfully the economy and industry of the Nation for a successful prosecution of a defense program or of a war program, if war should come to pass. The guiding principle and the controlling obligation of the Chairman of the Munitions Board should be, and must be, to develop a program which will serve the best interests of the country, irrespective of the sacrifices which it may call upon industry to make.

It is not my intention, and I am sure it is not the intention of the chairman of the subcommittee, to dwell upon past mistakes, other than to mention them

in passing in order to make the record perfectly clear, and in order that notice may be served that we expect the Munitions Board to carry out the true, clear obligations inherent in the responsibilities which have been imposed on it and assigned to it in the Unification Act.

It is true, some of us are satisfied that America's defense would be in a much stronger position today if the Munitions Board had been doing a much better job than it has been doing in connection with both the surplus property problem and the stockpiling problem, as well as the other duties which were assigned to it. I sincerely hope that other departments of the Government will take note of the record which the Military Preparedness Committee has made to date, and that they will fully understand from that record that the members of the subcommittee intend to proceed on each problem that it takes under investigation with a thorough study of the facts. We intend to permit the facts to speak for themselves and also to permit the facts to fall upon all heads concerned with the facts, irrespective of consequences, because we believe that as the elected representatives of the people we have a serious duty to perform for the American people, namely, the duty of seeing to it that we function as an effective check upon various departments, agencies, and officials, who have responsibilities in connection with the defense program and the war program, both on the military mobilization side and on the side of economic and industrial mobilization.

Members of the subcommittee, based on the information which has been made available to us on a great many matters—and I am sure I now bespeak the point of view of all members of the committee—would have the American people take stock of the seriousness of the crisis which confronts us, and of the importance that all groups within the Nation proceed on a united front to do whatever may be necessary and make whatever sacrifices may be necessary in order to place the United States in the strongest possible defense position in the shortest possible time, because we believe that is the surest guaranty we have of being able to check the possibility of a third world war.

Mr. President, I now come to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, various members of the press have asked me for an answer to a question which I have not yet given them. I now give it to them. The question has been raised as to whether or not the motion which the junior Senator from Oregon made in a meeting of the Subcommittee on the Labor-Management Relations, which was adopted without objection, calling for an investigation on the part of the professional staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the National Labor Relations Board was limited to the office of General Counsel or was intended to go to the policies of the Board and the practices of the Board, as well as of the office of the General Counsel.

It was the intention of the junior Senator from Oregon, it was so understood by the members of the committee, and the junior Senator from Oregon made it very clear, that the investigation should cover not only the policies, practices, and procedures of the office of the General Counsel, but the policies, practices, and procedures of the Board as well. In fact, Mr. President, it was agreed yesterday that the professional staff of the committee should proceed with the preliminary work and that at a later date the committee would decide whether or not, after Members of the Senate returned to Washington, following either a recess or adjournment, we should proceed with public hearings. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon that public hearings should be held, and undoubtedly will be held.

It is the intention of the junior Senator from Oregon to make a very careful inquiry, particularly into the practices and policies and administration of the Chairman of the Board, because he is satisfied that the controversy and the conflicts which characterized the administration of the National Labor Relations Board in recent months have been such as are typical of most controversies; namely, they have been two-sided affairs. The junior Senator from Oregon intends to find out to what extent the Chairman of the Board must show responsibility for that controversy.

It would appear in the opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon that the investigation may disclose that the National Labor Relations Board has become a very creaking piece of machinery, although I doubt if very much can be done to make the Board of maximum service to the American people in handling problems of industrial relations so long as the Taft-Hartley law is on the books in its present form. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I think the time has come for a thorough investigation and possibly a little fumigation of the National Labor Relations Board.

I think my comments and their obvious implications should leave no room for doubt as to what the junior Senator from Oregon intended when he made his motion yesterday in the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations that the staff of the committee be instructed to proceed with a preliminary investigation of the policies, practices, and procedures of both the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and of the Board itself, including the Chairman of the Board.

UNITED NATIONS FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in these closing days of this session, I wish to remind the Senate that the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations will not much longer remain in Washington, but will be moved to Rome early next year. This is in accordance with the decision made last fall by the representatives of the 60 nations which comprise the membership of the FAO.

This move of headquarters away from the United States will undoubtedly de-

prive us of some of the benefits which we have enjoyed from having the FAO centered here in Washington. But we should not let the move lessen our interest in this great world agency, in the formation and operation of which Americans have played such prominent parts.

Every one of our major farm organizations has given solid backing to FAO. They had a big hand in launching it. They consider FAO as "their baby" among all the international organizations. How much our farm organizations may differ on other matters, they are united in support of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

FAO was born in this country in 1943. It is 2 years older than the United Nations, and the first of the great world organizations devoted to peace and prosperity. It has devoted itself from the start to helping the people of the world get more and better food to eat, and to aiding the farmers of every nation, including our own, to get a profitable income from their work.

It is a source of pride and at the same time a reassurance to me that a real American dirt farmer, N. E. Dodd, is at the head of this world agency. I have known of the work of Ed Dodd for years, and I am happy to take this occasion to pay tribute to him for the contribution he has made to the farmers of America and of the world. I know that under him FAO is going to continue its good work.

Ed Dodd has always served the farmer. He is an outstanding example of a man of the soil who has worked hard and unselfishly in the service of his fellowmen, first in our own country, and then throughout the world.

In a little more than a decade he rose from farming in his native State of Oregon to regional responsibilities. Later he became head of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and then Undersecretary of Agriculture. His wide farming and governmental experience made him the unanimous choice for Director-General of FAO to succeed its first head, the famed Sir John Boyd Orr.

Today Ed Dodd is a world farm leader. He possesses greater first-hand knowledge of agricultural problems all over the world than anyone—present or past. His success reflects credit to the United States.

I know of no man, Mr. President, whose judgment on agricultural matters is more respected in the committees of the United States Congress than that of Ed Dodd. This confidence is the result of his long years of recognized ability in this field, and to the fact that Ed Dodd's word has always been good.

The point 4 program will bring new responsibilities to FAO. I, for one, am glad that the leadership of this agency is in the hands of a man whose hard-headed experience and whose wide understanding of agricultural problems guarantee that technical assistance programs will be on a sound and practical basis.

FAO is going to need in the future enough funds to do a decent job. We have helped financially, and must do more. At a time when we are spending

billions for arms, we must also spend some few millions for promoting the best long-time defense of all—a well-fed world.

The goal of a well-fed world is a difficult one, but under the leadership of Ed Dodd, FAO can march steadily toward it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Harold A. Lockhart, of Kansas City, Mo., to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

George C. Marshall, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense;

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley, United States Army, for appointment as General of the Army in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Maurice Robert Holt, and sundry other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two nominations on the calendar which have heretofore gone over, be passed over again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 20, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 19 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Donald W. Nyrop, of Nebraska, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, vice Delos Wilson Rentzel.

Delos Wilson Rentzel, of Texas, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the terms of 6 years expiring December 31, 1953, vice Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr., resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may we now yield ourselves gladly and unreservedly to the leading of Thy spirit for we cannot meet our various experiences faithfully and discharge our duties efficiently unless Thou dost guide and guide us with divine wisdom and strength.

Thou knowest how frequently we falter and break faith with Thee and our better self. When we bring our lives under the searching light and scrutiny of Thy divine law we are filled with an accusing and haunting sense of our disobedience and failure.

Humbly and confidently we would on this day join the vast multitude of believing souls in fervent prayer for the coming of that blessed time when this beautiful world, which Thou has created, shall never again be cursed by war, blasted by cruelty, and darkened by hatred.

God forbid that we should ever feel that the proclamation of the angel of peace on earth and good will among men is merely a dream and that it lies beyond the sphere of practical realization.

Wilt Thou bless in some special way the representatives of the united and freedom-loving nations as they take counsel together. Inspire them with the assurance that the God of peace is with them as they continue to affirm and champion courageously whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely and whatsoever things are of good report.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8847. An act to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 4136. An act to include the Coast Guard within the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948 and to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Coast Guard.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4569. An act authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa; and

H. R. 7940. An act to provide financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5226) to amend paragraph 207 of the Tariff Act of 1930, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 8, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The last sentence of section 3424 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the exemption of certain lumber from the import tax) is hereby amended by striking out 'and Western white spruce' and insert in lieu thereof 'Western white spruce, and Engelmann spruce.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to lumber entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the tenth day following the date of the enactment of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend paragraph 207 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and section 3424 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, as passed in the House of Representatives, this bill would establish a specific rate of \$1 per long ton for calcined bauxite imported for use in the manufacture of firebrick or other refractories. As explained in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, the calcined bauxite used for making refractories is not available in this country, and the reduction in the rate of duty will not adversely affect domestic bauxite producers. Favorable reports were received from the Department of State and the Treasury Department.

The Senate amendment would extend to Engelmann spruce lumber the exemption from the import tax imposed by section 3424 (a) now enjoyed by Northern white pine, Norway pine, and Western white spruce. Canada is the sole source of imports of Engelmann spruce lumber. The removal of the excise-import tax would result in Engelmann spruce lumber being subject only to the customs duty of 25 cents per thousand board feet. The Senate amendment is identical in terms with H. R. 4430, introduced by Mr. HORAN, of Washington, upon which the Treasury Department reported that—

The proposed legislation would obviate certain administrative difficulties now being encountered, since it would no longer be necessary for customs officials to ascertain whether the imported lumber was Engelmann rather than Western white spruce. The Department, therefore, favors enactment of the proposed legislation.

According to the Tariff Commission—

The tax on the approximately 7,000,000 board feet of Engelmann spruce lumber estimated to have entered the United States in 1948 has amounted to slightly more than \$5,000. This amount is small relative to the total revenue, and, as indicated above, it is very small in relation to the value of lumber imports.

Mr. Speaker, both the original House bill and the Senate amendment, therefore, appear to have merit, and I urge that the House agree to the Senate amendment.

DEDUCTIONS FROM WAGES OF SEAMEN FOR PAYMENT INTO EMPLOYEE WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8349) to authorize deductions from the wages of seamen for payment into employee welfare funds.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and encourage the American foreign carrying trade and for other purposes," approved June 26, 1884 (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 599), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply to, or render unlawful, deductions made by an employer from the wages of a seaman, pursuant to the written consent of the seamen, if (1) such deductions are paid into a trust fund established for the sole and exclusive benefit of seamen employed by such employer, and their families and dependents (or of such seamen, families, and dependents jointly with seamen employed by other employers and their families and dependents); and (2) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of providing, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of such seamen, their families, and dependents, medical and/or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of the seamen, life insurance, unemployment benefits, compensation for illness or injuries resulting from occupational activity, sickness, accident, and disability compensation, or any one or more of the foregoing benefits, or for the purpose of purchasing insurance to provide any one or more of such benefits."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, change "seamen" to "seaman."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF PETROLEUM AS FUEL ABOARD STEAM VESSELS

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3796) to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the use of petroleum as fuel aboard steam vessels.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4474 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 467), is amended to read as follows: "Sec. 4474. When crude petroleum of a flash point not less than 150° F. is carried in the double-bottom fuel tanks of steamers using the same for fuel, the crude petroleum carried in such tanks in excess of the necessities of the voyage may be discharged at terminal ports when no passengers are on board the ship. Crude petroleum carried and discharged under these conditions will not be considered stores or cargo within contemplation of section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 170), and will be considered as only for use as fuel within the contemplation of section 4417a (1) of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 391a (1))."

This bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 813) was laid on the table.

ALLOTMENT OF WAGES OF SEAMEN

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3960) to amend subsection (b) of section 10 of the act of June 26, 1884, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 599 (b)).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what does the bill do?

Mr. HART. It merely extends the existing law so that seamen may, with their written consent, make allotments of their salaries to purchase United States bonds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 10 of the act of June 26, 1884, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 599 (b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) It shall be lawful for any seaman to stipulate in his shipping agreement for an allotment of any portion of the wages he may earn (1) to his grandparents, parents, wife, sister, or children; (2) to his employer for the purpose of purchasing for the seaman United States Savings bonds; or (3) for deposits to be made in an account opened by him and maintained in his name either at a savings bank or a United States postal savings depository subject to the governing regulations thereof."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out all beginning on line 9, after "to", through line 10 and insert: "an agency duly designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for the handling of applications for United States savings bonds, for the purpose of purchasing such bonds for the seamen;"

Page 1, line 11, after the word "account", insert the words "for savings, or investment,"

Page 2, line 3, after the word "thereof", insert a comma and the words "or a savings

institution in which such accounts are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 9266) was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF ANNETTA BACHIS AND OTHERS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3995) for the relief of Annetta Bachis, Anna Bellani, Angelina Colombo, Maria Grazia Impari, Franca Porricino, and Antonia Tirabassi, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 4 to 7, inclusive, and insert:

"Sec. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that said quota or quotas are available."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER MARIA EMELIA (ANNA BOHN)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5083), for the relief of Sister Maria Emelia (Anna Bohn), with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "required", insert "visa fee and."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIKA KUEBART AND HER MINOR SON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7390) for the relief of Erika Kuebart and her minor son, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 15, after "son", insert "as of the date of their entry into the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how many of those bills are there?

Mr. WALTER. There are six more.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do they in a general way repeal the over-all immigration acts?

Mr. WALTER. They do not repeal any acts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But they make exceptions all the time?

Mr. WALTER. These are all technical amendments to bills that were passed by the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but were the bills in the beginning exceptions to get certain people into this country?

Mr. WALTER. No, they are not, because every person who is admitted under a private bill comes under the quota control, so that a quota number is deducted and the over-all number of immigrants is in nowise increased.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then do I correctly understand that this is sort of preferential treatment for certain individuals, and gets them in ahead of the time they would come in under the quota?

Mr. WALTER. No, none of these bills has that effect.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, these bills were considered thoroughly by the committee, and these amendments which have been suggested by the other body are agreeable to the committee.

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is that assurance to all of us that they are unobjectionable in every way?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OTTAVIA DE GASPARE ET AL.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7631) for the relief of Ottavia De Gaspare and Sandra De Gaspare, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 15, after "Gaspare", insert "as of the date of their entry into the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD MOW ET AL.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8452) for the relief of Ronald Mow and Angeline Cecilia Mow, with a Senate amendment

thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, after "citizen", insert "": *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Ronald Mow and Angeline Cecilia Mow are the natural-born minor children of the said Peter Mow."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED HESS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8718) for the relief of Fred Hess, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "the said."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNMARIE STRITTER AND DAUGHTER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8769) for the relief of Annmarie Stritter and her minor daughter, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after "daughter", insert "as of the date of their entry into the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIFUMI KATO AND SON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9084) for the relief of Hifumi Kato and her minor son, Kazuyuki Kato, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Hifumi Kato, the Japanese fiancée of John B. Howenstein, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and her son, Kazuyuki Kato,

and that said Hifumi Kato and her above-named son may be eligible for visas as non-immigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Hifumi Kato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said John B. Howenstein, and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Hifumi Kato and her son, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of Hifumi Kato and her son, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of them as of the date of their entry into the United States, upon the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TACKETT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

(Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include statements he considers necessary for the information of the Members of the House in connection with S. 784.)

LABOR CZARS IN CONTROL

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, making this statement will do me no good personally. It will bring the wrath of the political bosses down on my head. Nevertheless, it is my duty to cry out against movements that threaten the life of this Nation.

Our President, like many Members of Congress, is in effect a prisoner of the labor bosses. At the behest of the politicians, and obviously for votes, the President has just fired our most able and conscientious official in the field of labor relations, to wit: Mr. Robert Denham, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. Apparently the Taft-Hartley Act is now to be misconstrued and emasculated, or wholly ignored.

The President has just imposed necessary controls on segments of the coun-

try's business, but no controls are likely to be imposed on labor. In fact, the White House has practically invited the labor bosses to demand another round of wage increases in the big industries. Apparently, we are helpless to defend ourselves against ruinous inflation. The country's credit is already impaired and our whole economy is seriously threatened by inflation and price increases.

Since this Chamber is largely filled with self-declared liberals, these words, for the most part, will fall on deaf ears. Strange that good men should brag about their part in helping to destroy a great Nation.

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Congress should not adjourn until it has passed an excess-profits tax. According to the press, the House and Senate conferees have come to an agreement that makes it plain that no excess-profits-tax legislation will be reported out this year. Furthermore, if the next Congress considers legislation of this sort it is stated that it may be made retroactive to July 1 or October 1 of this year.

What is this Congress thinking of when it accepts such statements as these. If this Congress does not take action now, it is quite likely that if the next Congress does consider an excess-profits bill it will not report out a measure before next July and it may not even be retroactive. It must be remembered that the Senate Finance Committee, in its report on the tax bill, stated that an excess-profits tax, if passed, would apply to 1951 profits.

I want to ask the House this question: Is it fair to raise the taxes paid by individuals with incomes of \$5,000 or less by 20 percent, beginning October 1, and at the same time, refuse to impose an excess-profits tax on corporations making the biggest profits in history? Furthermore, we must remember that due to the rise in the cost of living since June 25, 1950, the people who are going to be asked to pay this 20-percent tax have already suffered a severe loss in their take-home pay. What we will be doing, if we fail to measure up to our responsibilities on the excess-profits tax question will be to feed the greedy and penalize the needy.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the law affecting labor-management relations is nullified when the office of the general counsel is vacant. I am advised by competent attorneys that no complaints may be filed by

anyone other than the General Counsel himself. The Board has no authority to accept complaints, nor may it nominate anyone for this duty, under the law.

As you know, the President has removed General Counsel Robert Denham. He has named no successor. At midnight last night this country became completely unprotected from unscrupulous acts of labor leaders or employers, acts which would be the subject of complaints filed by the general counsel. Thus, the American people are completely unprotected, at a time when defense contracts are mounting, when there is a greater market for labor and when the costs of living are surging upward.

This creates a situation which is a tinder box, unless all parties remain calm and carefully refrain from any act which might produce controversy. I am hopeful that labor will accept its responsibility and make a solemn attempt to maintain peace on the labor-management front, and that management in turn will take no steps which might result in the possibility of work stoppages. Certainly deliberate attempts to take advantage of the fact that we have no law to protect us in this emergency will be resented by the American people. We cannot carry on a war in the Far East while outlaws are running wild here at home, and I think that every person who stimulates unrest in this time of emergency is no less than an outlaw. Any restraint on our great production or on our tremendous service facilities, including our transportation systems, will certainly be abhorrent to the American people, and will justify, in my mind, a special session of Congress should such occur after our adjournment.

THE KATYN MASSACRE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that the Army has released information having to do with the release of a statement by Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., with relation to the facts and circumstances surrounding the odious Katyn Forest massacre.

Ever since this inhumane outrage was perpetrated much uncertainty has surrounded the true facts and responsibility for this crime against humanity.

Colonel Van Vliet, taken against his wishes to the scene of the crime by the Germans, now declares that from his observation on the ground it is his conclusion that this mass murder—these 3,000 separate murders—were committed by the Russians.

Each one of these dead Polish heroes was shot in the back of the head; many of them had their hands tied behind their backs. The similarity of these murders to the murders committed by the North Koreans on American troops during recent weeks is of striking similarity.

Brave little Poland was proud of its battle cry "the first to fight" against

the Nazis. Poland has fought totalitarian Russia for centuries—whether it be the czarism and the Cossacks of Romanov or the communism and secret police of the Bolshevik. No longer can this heinous and revolting outrage be ignored by the governments of the civilized world.

In view of the report, heretofore secret, released by the Army, the Government of the United States should direct its delegates to the United Nations in the Security Council and in the General Assembly to formally demand the creation of a special commission of the United Nations to investigate fully and to fix responsibility for one of the most shocking and revolting offenses against man and God in world history.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REARMING EUROPE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RICH. Not if it is to come out of my 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman yields it will be taken out of his time.

Mr. RICH. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I hear many speeches made about raising taxes, but I do not hear anyone talking about injecting a little economy in spending the taxpayer's money.

This morning's paper carried the headlines that Administrator Hoffman warned against legislation cutting off ECA aid to countries giving war material to Russia and other iron-curtain countries.

Let me say that if you are going to tax the American people to send merchandise out of this country to other countries with the full knowledge that they are at liberty to send it to Russia and other iron-curtain countries and then spend our own money trying to arm those countries against Russia, it is just plumb crazy. I think every Member of Congress who votes for the ECA appropriation bill that is scheduled to come before us this week, to spend \$4,000,000,000 to arm these countries ought to go home and ask his constituents what they think about his vote and whether they are going to send him back to Congress. Such spending is wrong and inconsistent. I am against it and everyone here ought to be against it.

PROTECTION AGAINST UN-AMERICAN AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. WOOD submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9490) to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes.

TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Friday following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore granted.

AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress recently enacted far-reaching amendments to the Social Security Act, one important group was omitted from consideration; that is those now serving in our Armed Forces.

Provision was made that veterans of World War II should receive a credit of \$160 for each month of service. But the trouble is that a cut-off date of July 24, 1947, was provided in the legislation which would eliminate any now serving who have been drafted or voluntarily enlisted since 1947.

It is inexcusable that this neglect should continue. Our fighting forces should have the assurance of this social-security credit from the time they volunteer or are drafted into the Armed Forces of their country. This confidence that they are still making provision for their old age and the welfare of their wives and any dependents, while fighting thousands of miles away or training for combat in camps in this country, is essential if we are to preserve the morale and spirit of our Armed Forces. Men who are leaving their jobs and homes to fight the forces of aggression should be relieved as far as possible from any worries about the future well-being of their loved ones.

I am, therefore, today introducing a bill to correct this serious oversight by making the provisions of section 217 of the Social Security Act dealing with credits for veterans, applicable to members

of our Armed Forces who serve at any time during the period when United Nations forces are engaged in the Korean War.

Passage of such a measure is tremendously important to our fighting men. They are making heavy sacrifices to guarantee the future security of each one of us. It is unjust to ask them to jeopardize their own old-age security in the process. This Congress should not consider adjournment until it has acted on this simple amendment, which should meet with no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SAM HARDY

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the city on August 31 when my colleagues in the House paid tribute to Sam Hardy on the occasion of his retirement from service with the Ways and Means Committee.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and as one who came to know Sam well, I wish to add my tribute concerning his long and valuable service, and to extend my every wish for many happy years for him and his wife in his retirement.

Sam served with the Ways and Means Committee for over 42 years. Few serve a committee of the Congress so long and so well. His cheerfulness, his efficiency, and his loyalty will be long remembered, and the committee will sorely miss his services. He is a fine American and a good friend.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Friday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] obtained a special order for Friday next. Can the gentleman advise whether the House will be in session on Friday?

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman cannot advise just what the situation may be but he feels that the gentleman from

Pennsylvania will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of us are greatly concerned about this matter. The Republicans have a convention in Grand Rapids, Mich., on the 23d, next Saturday. They have a sort of pre-convention meeting the day before. Some of the Republicans in Michigan—I do not assume the Democrats are interested—would like to get away to attend that meeting but we want to attend to our business here and we intend to. Can the gentleman be helpful?

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman that is one reason we are meeting earlier tomorrow, to try to clear away the business.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Could not the gentleman make it 10 o'clock?

Mr. PRIEST. It seems better to make it 11.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Still reserving the right to object, what about this antisubversive bill, can the gentleman tell us when that will come up?

The SPEAKER. That will be the first order of business tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the conclusion of the work of this Eighty-first Congress I should like to take this opportunity to express publicly my personal appreciation of the cooperation my colleagues have given me as the minority whip during these past 2 years.

As always, we are naturally anxious for the Congress to adjourn in order that we may return to our respective homes, and yet I have a certain feeling of regret as the Congress comes to an end. I regret that a number of my colleagues, who have had many years of distinguished service, have decided to retire from congressional work. I will miss them. They will be missed by all of us. They leave us with our very best wishes for many years of good health and happiness.

I particularly wish to say a word about the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Bob RICH, who has decided not to be a candidate for reelection to the Congress. He has been one of my closest personal friends. He has been a constant joy and inspiration to me. I have visited in his home, and he has visited in mine. No man could mean as much to me as Bob RICH.

And I do not believe that any man has served in this Congress who is more highly regarded by all of us. He is a man of convictions and with the courage of his convictions. He is one of those rare individuals who has dedicated his life to the service of his fellowmen. Nothing gives Bob RICH greater pleas-

ure than to be able to do things for others.

In the fullest sense of the word Bob RICH is a Christian gentleman. He has enjoyed life and made an immeasurable contribution to life by always extending the helping hand. And I say he has been a constant source of joy and inspiration to me.

I frequently play golf with Bob RICH. It is on the golf course under the pressure of competition that one begins to see the kind of stuff a man is made of. He likes competition—he loves it—he wants to win—he gives his best to win—but never once would he take unfair advantage in order to conquer.

As you know, Bob RICH is a successful businessman. He has been successful in everything he has undertaken. You are probably aware that he serves on the board of trustees of several schools in Pennsylvania. He continues to give of his time and energy to this work because he is interested in young people in seeing that they have opportunities to improve themselves.

There is so much that I could say about Bob RICH that I find it difficult to know just what and how to say it. There are no words that can express my personal regard and deep affection for him. I know I express the sentiment of every Member of the House when I say to him: Bob, we will miss you. We hope you will return from time to time that we may benefit from your wise counsel and stimulating personality.

AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF FORT DES MOINES TO IOWA

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4569) authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 3097)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4569) authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, and 5 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Page 1, lines 6 and 7, in lieu of the language stricken out by the Senate insert the following: "without consideration save as contained in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Page 1, line 9, strike out the language inserted

by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That if conveyance hereunder is made to the State of Iowa, the instrument of conveyance shall provide that said State shall not alienate title to said property or any part thereof, but shall keep it intact and use it for public purposes, and that if the United States needs the property for military purposes, it shall revert to the United States with payment to the State of the reasonable value at that time for any improvements thereon made by the State"; and the Senate agree to the same.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN,
HARRY P. CAIN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4569) authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

H. R. 4569 as passed by the House authorizes and directs the transfer of about 640 acres of land, with improvements thereon, known as Fort Des Moines Army Post, now owned by the Government. This property has been declared surplus and the State of Iowa, which formerly purchased the property with funds raised by public subscription and donated it to the Government about the year 1901 as a site for an Army post, now desires to have it returned for use by its National Guard and for other public purposes.

The Senate amended the bill to make the transfer of the property discretionary, and also on a subsequent request of the Army excepted three additional building units for its use, and also at the request of the Housing and Home Finance Agency required the continued use of certain buildings now occupied by veterans as temporary housing quarters. The House conferees agreed to these amendments, Nos. 1, 4, and 5.

With respect to amendment No. 3, the Senate amended the bill to provide for payment by the State of consideration in the amount of one-half of the appraised value of the property with the improvements thereon. The conferees agreed that appropriate consideration should be made to the United States for the transfer of this property but concluded that there were several elements involved in the proposed transfer which, it was agreed, would constitute appropriate and adequate compensation. These elements are as follows: (1) The State purchased this property at a cost of \$64,000 and donated it to the United States for use as an Army post, which use has been discontinued; (2) the State will devote the property to public use and will keep the property intact and return it to the United States upon payment of the fair value of any improvements added by the State in event it is needed again for military purposes; (3) the Army reserves the right to use several building units for its purposes; (4) the units now occupied by veterans as temporary housing will be maintained; and (5) the State will furnish all necessary sewerage facilities for the buildings mentioned without cost and shall furnish electricity and water at the prevailing rate in the locality or at cost, whichever is lower, so long as the buildings are used by the United States for military purposes.

Accordingly, the conferees agreed to change the language of amendment No. 3 to provide that if the land is conveyed to the

State under the terms of this act, the conveyance shall provide that the State shall not alienate title to the property but shall use it for public purposes and shall keep it intact and that, if it is needed for military purposes, it shall revert to the United States. In the opinion of the conferees, this change, together with the elements mentioned above, will accomplish the purpose of the Senate amendment.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this bill passed the House originally on the Consent Calendar. It provided for the transfer of Fort Des Moines to the State of Iowa subject to the reservation of certain buildings and to the State of Iowa furnishing sewerage facilities for the buildings. The bill was amended in the Senate to make it optional with the United States to convey the property and to require the State of Iowa to pay one-half of the appraised fair market value of the lands and improvements. It was also amended to make the transfer subject to the use of certain of the property by GI's. The bill was further amended to reserve other buildings. The House agreed to all the Senate amendments except the amendment requiring payment of half the value of the land and buildings. A substitute for the Senate amendment was agreed to by the conferees. It provides that if conveyed the State of Iowa could not alienate any of the property but would be required to keep it intact and use it for public purposes; that if needed for military purposes the title would revert to the United States upon the payment of the reasonable value of the improvements made by the State at the time of the reversion of the title.

Fort Des Moines had been declared to be surplus property. Such property was disposed of under the acts of Congress. The consideration varied but there was no set rule as to the amounts to be paid under the surplus property acts. Under the regulations, transfers were made to Federal agencies, often to State agencies, to charitable, scientific, and educational institutions for nominal considerations. The conferees believed that the consideration agreed to in the conference would be in the public interest. If needed for military purposes, the property will not be transferred. Instead of being conveyed under the statutes with respect to the disposal of war surplus property, the General Services Administration felt that Congress should pass a special act, to transfer Fort Des Moines to the State of Iowa, inasmuch as the real consideration for the transfer of the property was its use originally by the State National Guard. The conference report is unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. DONDERO. I have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1292) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (D) of paragraph (2) of section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "citizenship under the law of such nation" a colon and the following: "And provided further, That, notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision (C) hereof and of this subdivision (D), return may be made to an individual who at all times since December 7, 1941, was a citizen of the United States, or to an individual who, having lost United States citizenship solely by reason of marriage to a citizen or subject of a foreign country, reacquired such citizenship prior to the date of enactment of this proviso if such individual would have been a citizen of the United States at all times since December 7, 1941, but for such marriage."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, after "marriage" insert: "And provided further, That the aggregate value of returns made pursuant to the foregoing proviso shall not exceed \$5,000,000; and in making returns under such proviso the Alien Property Custodian shall to the extent practicable make such returns in the order in which notices of claims therefor were received and may return any property or interest if the value thereof, taken together with the aggregate value of property and interests already returned pursuant to such proviso, does not exceed \$5,000,000."

"Sec. 2. There shall be included in the report made to Congress pursuant to section 6 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, a statement of (1) the names and nationalities of persons who have filed notice of claim for the return of any property or interest under section 1 of this act, the date of the filing of such notice of claim, and the estimated value of the property or interest, and (2) the names and nationalities of persons to whom returns have been made of any property or interest under section 1 of this act and the value of such property or interest."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3727) to authorize certain construction at Griffiss Air Force Base, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is hereby authorized to establish or develop an Air Force Electronic

Development Center at Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y., by the acquisition of land, construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, as follows: Alterations of buildings and the provision of related electronic test sites and instrument landing test facilities.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,114,500 to carry out the purposes of this act.

Sec. 3. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available for expenses incident to construction, including administration, overhead planning and surveys, and shall be available until expended when specifically provided in the appropriation act.

Sec. 4. Any projects authorized herein may be prosecuted under direct appropriations, or authority to enter into contracts in lieu of such appropriations.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this measure provides for the removal of an Air Force electronic laboratory known as Watson Laboratories from Fort Monmouth, N. J., to Rome, N. Y. It has been the subject of great controversy in the House Committee on Armed Services and in the Senate.

Several years ago the Air Force decided that they ought to consolidate all their electronic research work at Rome, N. Y., where they had a large, unused depot. Opposition arose to the removal of the research laboratory at Cambridge, Mass., so the Air Force dropped the consolidation plan as far as Cambridge, Mass., was concerned but proceeded with the plan to take this important laboratory out of the State of New Jersey. Incidentally, it is not located in my district.

It seems to me that with the all-out effort we are making now to prepare ourselves for protection against war it is extremely ill-advised. The testimony of a high official of the Air Force yesterday indicated that if they moved this laboratory, disturbing about 1,100 technically trained men working now as a team, it would take from 6 to 9 months to get it reestablished and working effectively.

I think it is a mistake in judgment. I think also there is a slight aroma of politics involved in it. It is indeed unfortunate that in order to strengthen a congressional district defense money should be used, especially at a time like this. I hope the House will vote this measure down.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement I made earlier before the House Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, the statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY L. TOWE, NINTH DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, TO THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, MARCH 21, 1950

Mr. Chairman, the committee will recall that the public-works bill, H. R. 4766, which was presented to this committee during the first session of this Congress, contained an item for Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y., which was identical to the item which appears in the present public-works bill which

is before you for consideration, S. 2440 (p. 16, lines 10-14). The amount of money was also the same, \$3,114,500. Of this sum, \$2,181,500 was designated as the amount of money necessary to alter buildings at Griffiss Air Force Base to accommodate the electronics laboratory equipment and technical personnel located at the Watson Electronic Laboratories in New Jersey. An additional sum of \$600,000 was asked for the alteration of facilities at Griffiss Air Force Base in such a manner as to provide four climatic test chambers. At this time, similar climatic test facilities are in existence at the Army Signal Corps laboratories at Fort Monmouth, N. J., and are being jointly used by the Air Force personnel at Watson Laboratories.

Now, before we consider the merits of this matter, I think that the members should understand that at the time the moving of electronics research facilities from New Jersey to Rome, N. Y., was first considered, it was intended to consolidate all of the Air Force effort in this field at Griffiss Air Force Base. The Air Force has a similar facility at Cambridge, Mass., which was considered in the original plan. They also have similar facilities at Wright-Patterson Field, and there may be other similar facilities at other bases. At any rate, by the time H. R. 4766 was presented to the committee, the only facility which was to be moved was the Watson Laboratories from Eatontown, N. J. The Cambridge facility had been deleted. I am sure that the members are well aware of the fact that pressure from the proper sources applied at the proper place will accomplish wonders.

I wanted to point out these considerations so that the members may not be misled into believing that the contemplated move of the Watson Laboratories to the Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y., is a consolidation of the same or similar type facilities. This is not a consolidation. It is simply the moving of a facility from one place to another.

During the course of the controversy over the proposed move of this facility, numerous Members of Congress, as well as outside individuals and organizations, have expressed their desire to be objective about this situation. They have stated that they are motivated solely by the best interests of national defense and economy in government. My position is no different than theirs, but perhaps it will assume more validity when I say to you that the Watson Laboratory is not in my district. It is more than 70 miles away, and its retention or removal has no political significance to me. If the Air Force can show that the removal of this laboratory from New Jersey to New York is in the best interests of national defense and economy, then I shall join the proponents of the move. But I want to say to you that, in my opinion, they have completely failed to make a case either in the interests of national defense or economy. It is my intention to be thoroughly objective in my consideration of the comparative merits of these two sites and, with that in mind, I want to outline to you the considerations which prompt my opposition to the move.

1. The Air Force has stated that Griffiss Air Force Base, which was completed about 1944, consists of lands and facilities which cost the Government \$36,000,000. Admittedly, there are a number of well-constructed, permanent-type buildings located on more than 30,000 acres of land. A number of the buildings are now vacant and the remaining buildings are being used as supply facilities. The Watson Laboratories at Eatontown, N. J., were completed about 1944, are located on 160 acres of ground which, together with the buildings thereon, cost \$1,800,000. In addition to that fact, the buildings accommodate research facilities and equipment valued at more than \$7,000,000. There can be no dispute that the buildings at Griffiss Air Force Base are of more permanent construction than those at the Watson Laboratories in New Jersey. Some of the

latter buildings are not desirable, however; a number of them are of concrete or cinder block construction and others are of excellent frame construction, and it is in these two latter types of buildings that research and development activities are conducted. Therefore, we are confronted with the choice of spending approximately \$3,000,000 in New York to accommodate these facilities, which cost is only a minor portion of the ultimate cost, or spending an equal or lesser amount to improve the facilities in New Jersey without the other disruptions which must necessarily be incurred if the move is executed. The Air Force alleges that if all of the buildings at the Watson Laboratories in New Jersey were destroyed and replaced with the type of buildings they desire, it would cost \$17,000,000, and they attempt to offset the expense of the move to New York by quoting this figure, thereby proving economy in the move. To me, such comparison is ridiculous. The Air Force states that the cost of transportation of all of their technical personnel from New Jersey to New York, their household effects and the equipment to be moved would be approximately \$500,000. Then according to the Air Force figures the only expense involved in this transfer appears to be the \$3,000,000 for alteration and the \$500,000 for transportation, or a total of about \$3,500,000.

A group of engineers at the Watson Laboratories have prepared their estimates of the cost involved in this move, and I want to give you those estimates. These men are engineers and scientists who are carrying on the primary mission of the laboratories and who expect to be moved to Griffiss Air Force Base if the proposed move is executed. They state that the preparation of the Griffiss Air Force Base, including alteration of buildings, and administration costs, and labor will be \$3,500,000; that the duplication of off-base sites and special facilities for testing the equipment will be \$2,000,000; that the moving costs for the first 330 persons, their equipment and the laboratory equipment will be \$2,800,000, and that contingent costs on contractors' claims, security checks and retraining of security personnel, delays in the development program, and the cost of coordinating two bases will be \$1,650,000; and that additional yearly costs for the first year, since both bases will be in operation for at least 1 year, will be \$1,500,000. This latter item includes travel cost increases between New York and Washington, New York and the Watson Laboratories in New Jersey, an increase in maintenance cost at New York and an increase in the off-base maintenance at Griffiss Air Force Base due to wider dispersion and more stringent weather. On the basis of these estimates, the total cost of the move would be \$11,500,000 as contrasted to the Air Force estimate of \$3,500,000. Now that is a very wide discrepancy. I want to be fair about the situation, and since I can't justify the discrepancy, I am willing to strike a balance between the two figures and, in doing so, I arrive at an estimated over-all cost of the move of \$7,500,000. It is my contention that the Air Force could take no more money than the \$3,500,000 which they admit it will cost them to make this move, and by repairs and new construction make a more desirable facility at the Watson Laboratories' site in New Jersey than they will have at the Griffiss Air Force Base in New York. Now, I want you to bear in mind that this is only a consideration of cold dollars and does not take into account other elements of equal or greater importance.

2. The Air Force contends that it needs an air strip adjacent to the Air Force facilities. My informants advise me that this is not of prime importance. The laboratory facility needs aircraft flights. On the rare occasions that work on the aircraft is required, it is easier and cheaper to send a man to the air strips, which are within easy driving distance of the Watson Laboratories, than to move all of Watson Laboratories to Rome, N. Y.,

to accomplish the same thing. One draws the inference from the Air Force arguments that runways are needed which will accommodate our largest type of bombers. The technicians who are doing the work do not agree with this contention. They state that almost 90 percent of the flight tests are not made by the laboratory personnel, but are made by the contractors who are manufacturing the equipment, with their own planes and from their own air fields. It is certainly true that any B-29 squadron must have sufficient flight training to maintain proficiency, and I contend that they might just as well be getting that proficiency on occasional flights from New York to New Jersey, when that type of aircraft is needed for a test, as in any other direction. To me, it is a major fallacy to charge the entire cost of such flight to the operational cost of the Watson Laboratories in its present location.

3. In its present location, the Watson Laboratories enjoy a very considerable topographical advantage over the New York site for radar testing. The topography in New Jersey is sufficiently open to permit low-level radar detection tests in any direction. It is likewise adjacent to the ocean over which a portion of the testing must be done. Neither of these facts is true at Griffiss Air Force Base. The ocean is more than 200 miles away, and the Griffiss Air Force Base is almost three-fourths enclosed by a mask of high hills which will prevent low-level radar detection tests. The only manner in which they can overcome this handicap is to build off-site testing stations in locations which are sufficiently far away from the hills surrounding the Griffiss Air Force Base as to permit the testing. It is my impression that the construction, transportation, and maintenance costs for such sites would be prohibitive.

4. If flight testing has the importance to the laboratory facility that has been indicated by the Air Force, then I insist that the relative qualities of the weather in the Rome area versus the New Jersey shore area has been obscured by thinking only in terms of weather aloft. From the ground electronics development viewpoint on flight testing, this is an emphasis which is grossly misplaced. If we assume that flight testing is being done for the purpose of collecting engineering data, ground conditions are of equal importance with weather aloft. Data requiring the use of delicate laboratory test equipment, or any outdoor experimental equipment which must be frequently adjusted, must be collected under fair weather ground conditions under which engineering personnel may be expected to work. Experimental equipment is fabricated with the intent of demonstrating techniques and feasibility of electronic operation. In this regard, early models are not designed as all-weather equipment, and thus are not winterized or greatly protected from the elements. The Rome outdoor testing would require considerable effort along these lines at a time when such work would normally be unnecessary. Knobs, controls, cabinets, and working parts would require special treatment. Cold weather can well be a greater factor in slowing down development progress than inclement weather.

Development and testing cannot be accomplished in bitter cold over the long period of time that winter exists in Rome, New York. Engineers in the Rome area and long-time residents of that area indicate that approximately 100 bad weather days may be expected per year. Since the data for the New Jersey site shows about 20 such days per year, it can be seen that a fivefold increase in nonoperable days will occur for laboratory personnel at New York. A secondary consideration is the weather aloft. The best qualitative information available indicates that the New Jersey shore enjoys much better weather conditions. A comparison between the two sites shows that at Griffiss Air Force

Base, New York, a total of 76 flights were completed in 1949. One hundred and three flights were canceled due to weather. At the Red Bank Airport, adjacent to the Watson Laboratories in New Jersey, there were thirty-two nonflying days due to weather during 1949.

5. The final point which I wish to submit for your consideration involves the availability of electronics manufacturers to the respective sites.

I have before me a list of the electronics contractors associated with Watson Laboratories at Eatontown, N. J. There are a total of 121 contractors on this list. I also have before me a map showing the location of each of these contractors with relation to the Watson Laboratories at Eatontown, N. J., and the Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y. The map very plainly shows that 4 of these contractors are located in the general area of Rome, N. Y., 30 to more than 100 miles from the Griffiss Air Force Base. The map also shows that 100 or more of these contractors are located in the vicinity of the Watson Laboratories in New Jersey, and I believe an accurate measurement would show them all to be within 50 miles of the present Watson Laboratories. All of the remaining 17 contractors are located closer to the Watson Laboratories than they are to Rome, N. Y. Now, in order to get the full significance of these facts, I think everyone should be informed of the manner in which these electronics contracts are performed. The Watson Laboratories' engineers and scientists perfect the plans for the development of a particular piece of equipment. The contract is then let and development is begun. During the course of the development, it is highly desirable that the scientists and engineers of the Watson Laboratories consult with the contractors' engineers. Under existing circumstances, this is a daily occurrence and is very easily accomplished since the personnel from Watson Laboratories can reach the contractors' plants in a very short time by automobile. While it may be true that some of these contracts could be let closer to the Griffiss Air Force Base if such facilities exist in that area, it remains a fact that New Jersey is acknowledged to be the heart of electronics research and development in the United States. The contractors' plants are there, and I think none of us would anticipate that they would be moved. I think the inevitable conclusion which we must reach is that if the Air Force is to obtain the maximum benefit from its electronics development with contractors in the New Jersey area, it must of necessity transport by air or otherwise its engineers and scientists from whatever site they may subsequently locate the Watson Laboratories. Rome, N. Y., is more than 200 miles by air from most of these contractors as contrasted to a driving distance of no more than 50 miles from the present site. If the laboratory is moved, there are two certain results: (a) the development program will be delayed due to the inconvenience of consultation between appropriate personnel, and (b) the loss of time and cost of transportation incurred by personnel going from the Rome area to the contractors will be entirely excessive.

When the proposed move of the Cambridge Laboratory was being discussed, various people very appropriately pointed out that the mission of that laboratory was basic and fundamental research which required the closest cooperation between the laboratory personnel and experts who were then working with Harvard University and MIT. I subscribe to that reason as being sufficient cause to maintain the Cambridge facility in its present location. Without that exchange of information and consultation, that facility could not accomplish the same results. In the case of the Watson Laboratories at Eatontown, N. J., I insist that the same logic applies but with a great deal more emphasis.

I recognize that the Air Force is trying to put its \$34,000,000 base at Rome, N. Y., into

constructive use. Its present use is extremely limited. I think there is one B-29 squadron there. Seven or eight of its permanent buildings are standing empty. But I insist that this is no reason to move the laboratory from New Jersey to Griffiss Air Force Base; it is merely an excuse.

As a completely collateral issue, I would like to point out that while the Air Force insists that it will reduce its overhead operating personnel by 205, it appears to give no consideration to the increased number of guard personnel who will be necessary to afford security protection to a base covering 5 square miles as contrasted to the present site of 160 acres. In the final analysis, I doubt that the personnel saving will be a matter of any consequence in this move. I would point out, however, that the move will cause 500 civil-service employees at the present laboratory to lose their jobs. There is no provision for their transportation to New York, and even if there were their civil-service status and seniority in New Jersey would have no protection in New York.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this bill (S. 3727), has been intensely investigated by the Armed Services Committee not only of the House but of the Senate, and extensive hearings have been held and many witnesses heard, so there can be no doubt that the matter has been thoroughly investigated. I have studied the transcript of all of the testimony with extreme care and I have also been very close to the problem because Watson Laboratories at Eatontown is located in the district which I represent. It is my considered opinion that the removal of the Watson Laboratories from Eatontown, N. J., to Rome, N. Y., is not in the best interest of the country, particularly in the development of electronic research for the Air Force. I can state my reasons briefly for this opinion.

First. The cost estimated by the representatives of the Air Force is much less than estimates which have been worked out with extreme care and only recently rechecked by disinterested parties. These later estimates were submitted to the committee by representatives of the employees of Watson Laboratories and their estimates are many times higher than those submitted by the Air Force. Anyone who reads the testimony given before the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House last February, is forced to the conclusion that the Air Force figures were reached by very confused reasoning and the questions presented to them were never answered satisfactorily.

Second. It is contended by the Air Force that an air strip adjacent to the laboratories is necessary for the development of their work, although for some 8 years Watson Laboratories has expanded and produced most efficient results with an air strip as far distant as 25 miles. I testified before the committee that with a small expenditure of money the Asbury Park airfield could be equipped with runways of sufficient length to accommodate the planes which might be used. The Asbury Park airfield is about 5 miles distant from Watson

Laboratories. In connection with this, it might also be pointed out that in the study of radar and electronics it is impossible to have any other air group functioning from the same locality. It is stated in the Rome papers that a fighting unit is now stationed at Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome and if this is the fact, it will interfere with the electronic research. A fighter unit must always be free from any other electronic activity in order to receive and send messages; electronic research must likewise be free and enjoy continuous uninterrupted activity.

Third. The present location of Watson Laboratories has a great topographical advantage over the New York site for radar testing and electronics work. In New Jersey the country is flat and permits low-level radar detection tests in any direction. There is a great advantage in having the ocean so near over which many tests are made. The use of the ocean is emphasized by the fact that Watson Laboratories very recently acquired about 5 acres of land on Sandy Hook which they said they would need for at least 1 year to conduct various experiments. Rome is situated at the base of the Adirondack Mountains and the terrain there is hilly and broken.

Fourth. The weather in New Jersey, according to the records, is far better for the flight testing of radar than Rome and I would point out that in 1949 only 76 flights were completed at the Griffiss Air Force Base and 103 flights were canceled due to the weather. At the Red Bank airport which is adjacent to the Watson Laboratories there were only 42 nonflying days during the entire year of 1949.

Fifth. The Watson Laboratories at Eatontown is situated in the center of electronics industry and the importance of this point cannot be emphasized too strongly. One hundred or more of a total of 121 contractors are located in the vicinity of Watson Laboratories in New Jersey, being within 50 miles thereof. Frequent visits by motor to these contractors are made by the staff at Watson Laboratories in connection with their work, whereas if they had to come all the way from Rome it would be a long and arduous trip. In order to really understand how significant this is, I would point out that at Watson Laboratories the engineers and scientists perfect plans for development of a particular piece of equipment and then a contract is let and the work begun with these different manufacturers. Of course, while this work is going on the scientists and engineers from Watson Laboratories must make frequent visits to consult and to supervise the work.

Sixth. The labor market for people who know about electronics is very tight and it is natural that the labor problem would be more easily solved in the vicinity of Eatontown, N. J., where electronics work is constantly being carried on. In addition to that, the Army Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth is at present expanding its work and the engineers at Watson and at Fort Monmouth are in daily consultation with each other. I am reliably advised that the authorities at Fort Monmouth are now seeking addi-

tional scientists and engineers and would be only too glad to acquire people at Watson Laboratories who did not wish to move to Rome. The result will be—if this move is completed—that many of the scientists and engineers will resign and be reemployed by the Signal Corps. These people have established their homes and families in that vicinity and naturally they do not wish to leave.

Of course, I could speak at length about the serious effect the removal of this installation would have on the community but I prefer to approach this subject—as I have done throughout the whole proceedings—from the point of view of what is best for our country's defense. By no wild stretch of the imagination can the breaking up and the disintegration of such a research development be made without seriously affecting the whole scheme of our defense.

How is the sudden haste and activity to report out of committee and act on this legislation to be accounted for? How is it that it has been permitted to lie quietly in the committee all these past 6 months without consideration? Why is it that so much feverish interest to enact this legislation has become aroused only 6 weeks before election day? Can it be that some Democratic Members of Congress need election aid and comfort? Can it be that this is another instance of playing politics with our country's defenses? That could be the fact and the mere suspicion that it might be should be enough to put an end to it. Such actions prompted by such motives are contemptible and despicable and will not be tolerated by a citizenry already aroused by the bungling and fumbling by those entrusted with the defense of the Nation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this measure passed the Senate the other day with only one dissenting vote. This matter has been considered by the House Committee on Armed Services over the period of the last 8 months. It was considered three different times by the subcommittee of which I was chairman and twice by the full Committee on Armed Services. On yesterday when the vote occurred in the full committee it was 22 to 2, as I recall. There were two dissenting votes. Both Members casting those dissenting votes were contacted today and have indicated they will not object to bringing up the bill at this time.

The matter simply involves an expenditure of some \$3,000,000 for defense construction which is badly needed. It should be done at once. The delay is holding up the development of the Electronic Center at Rome, N. Y. It should proceed without interruption and our committee so indicated yesterday. I hope the House will immediately pass the bill.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. Is it not true that the \$3,000,000 the gentleman is talking about is just the original investment?

Mr. BROOKS. No; the original investment is in the amount of \$36,000,000

which was invested in a war plant at Rome, N. Y., during the war. It has an appraised value at the present time of \$67,000,000, and it cost only about \$36,000,000.

Mr. SHAFER. Then how much beyond the \$3,000,000 will it cost for moving this laboratory to Rome, N. Y.?

Mr. BROOKS. The cost is \$500,000 to remove the laboratories to Rome. The \$3,000,000-plus provided in this bill is for some changes to be made largely in one of the buildings at Griffiss Air Base at Rome, N. Y. The matter has been thoroughly threshed out and everybody has indicated they are satisfied wholly with the investigation that was made, and I think the measure ought to be passed.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my distinguished friend. May I say he has worked very diligently and has done everything he could to properly present the views of the people in New Jersey in this matter.

Mr. TOWE. I do not believe the gentleman means to say that everybody is in agreement that this ought to be done—the gentleman means almost everybody.

Mr. BROOKS. I accept the correction.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Towe) there were—ayes 34, noes 13.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO MEMBERS OF RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. MORRIS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6319) to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

PASCH BROS.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1208) for the relief of Pasch Bros.

There being no objection, the Clerk will read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pasch Bros., of Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of \$1,937.75, which sum was paid by Pasch Bros. to the Oshkosh Brewing Co., of Oshkosh, Wis., to reimburse such company for the value of internal revenue tax stamps which had been affixed to beer manufactured by such company and which was found to have been contaminated by a material supplied by Pasch Bros. and was destroyed under supervision of Government officers, the Internal Revenue Bureau having ruled that no refund of the value of such tax stamps can be made: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated

in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERDA MOLLER ULDALE AND SON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1344) for the relief of Gerda Moller Uldall and her son, Mikkel Moller.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. RAY S. BERRUM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1501) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ray S. Berrum.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Ray S. Berrum, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for the death of their daughter, Dorothy Marie Berrum, who was killed by a United States marine in the District of Columbia, on or about October 5, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIDSHIPMAN WILLIS HOWARD DUKELOW, UNITED STATES NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3579) for the relief of Midshipman Willis Howard Dukelow, United States Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint Willis Howard Dukelow, midshipman, United States Navy, an ensign in the United States Navy and the Secretary of the Navy is thereafter authorized to effect his retirement or separation from the active list of the United States Navy in accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Upon such retirement or separation the said Willis Howard Dukelow shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay or disability severance pay as authorized by the Career Compensation Act of 1949: *Provided,* That pay as a midshipman shall in this case be deemed to be basic pay for the purposes of section 402 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO APPOINT COL. HENRY A. BYROADE AS DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF GERMAN AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3807) to authorize the President to appoint Col. Henry A. Byroade as Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, Department of State, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the existing provisions of law or any rules or regulations issued thereunder, the President is authorized to appoint Col. Henry A. Byroade, an officer in the Army of the United States, for a period not to exceed 2 years as Director, Bureau of German Affairs, or its successor in the Department of State, and Colonel Byroade's appointment to, acceptance of, and service as such Director of German Affairs shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the Army of the United States or any component thereof, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, eligibility for promotion, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided,* That so long as he remains Director, Bureau of German Affairs, or its successor, Colonel Byroade shall receive compensation at the rate of \$15,000 per annum and such traveling allowances as the Secretary of State shall prescribe, payable from appropriations made by law for the Department of State, in lieu of his military pay and allowances.

Sec. 2. In the performance of his duties as Director of the Bureau of German Affairs or its successor, Colonel Byroade shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were in no way connected with the Department of Defense or the Army of the United States or any component thereof.

Sec. 3. All periods of service performed by Colonel Byroade pursuant to the authority of this act shall be credited as active service in the Army of the United States for pay, promotion, and all other purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7735) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant to the Southern California Edison Co. an easement and right-of-way for electric transmission line purposes in the Santa Fe flood-control basin and the San Gabriel River improvement, California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized, for and on behalf of the United States, to grant to the Southern California Edison Co., a California corporation, its successors and assigns, on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, an easement and right-of-way for the construction, maintenance, operation, repair, replacement, enlargement, renewal, and removal of electric transmission lines, consisting of not more than four lines of steel towers, wires, cables, ground wires, insulators, communication circuits, and such other fixtures and appurtenances as the company may from time to time require, (1) in, under, on, over, and along a strip of land two hundred and fifty feet in width, extending across the Santa Fe flood-control basin and the San Gabriel River improvement between the mouth of San Gabriel Canyon and the Santa Fe Dam, in Los Angeles County, Calif.,

which strip of land is shown as unit M on drawing No. 157-K-15 of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, dated July 1949, revised October 24, 1949, approved by the Department of the Army and filed with the Corps of Engineers at Los Angeles, Calif., and (2) in, on, under, over, and across a parcel of land in the San Gabriel River improvement between the mouth of San Gabriel Canyon and the Santa Fe Dam, in Los Angeles County, Calif., which parcel of land is shown as unit O on drawing No. 157-K-17 of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, dated January 1950, approved by the Department of the Army and filed with the Corps of Engineers at Los Angeles, Calif.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "prescribe" insert "and at fair value."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER: On page 1, line 6, after the word "assigns" insert "for a period not to exceed 50 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUE PATENTS IN FEE TO CERTAIN BLACKFEET ALLOTTEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8877) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to the following-named persons patents in fee to their allotted lands on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.:

Wilbur Anderson, northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 33 north, range 7 west, and lot 1, section 31, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing seventy-nine and eighty-eight one-hundredths acres.

Rupert Anderson, northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 33 north, range 7 west, and lot 2, section 31, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing seventy-nine and ninety-one one-hundredths acres.

Gale Anderson, east half of the southeast quarter of section 28, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing eighty acres.

Joseph Anderson, northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 36, township 33 north, range 7 west, and southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 31, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing eighty acres.

Pauline Anderson (Cook), east half of the northeast quarter of section 28, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing eighty acres.

Myron W. Anderson, southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 33 north, range 7 west, and southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 24, township 37 north, range 11 west, Montana principal meridian, containing eighty acres.

Maude Marie Anderson (LeFebvre), southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 33 north, range 7 west, and southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 24, township 37 north, range 11 west, Montana principal meridian, containing eighty acres.

Collins Anderson, southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 36, township

33 north, range 7 west, and lot 4 of section 30, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing seventy-nine and eighty one-hundredths acres.

Sec. 2. Said patents in fee when issued shall contain a reservation to the United States of the oil, gas, and all other mineral deposits as provided in the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 5, after the word "Anderson", insert the following: "Junior".

Page 3, line 9, strike the word "eighty" and insert the words "eighty-two."

Page 3, line 11, strike the words "United States" and insert the words "Blackfeet Tribe of Indians."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 3814 be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to the following-named persons patents in fee to their allotted lands on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.:

Wilbur Anderson, northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 33 north, range 7 west, and lot 1, section 31, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing seventy-nine and eighty-eight one-hundredths acres.

Rupert Anderson, northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 33 north, range 7 west, and lot 2, section 31, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing seventy-nine and ninety-one one-hundredths acres.

Gale Anderson, east half of the southeast quarter of section 28, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 80 acres.

Joseph Anderson, northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 36, township 33 north, range 7 west, and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 31, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 80 acres.

Pauline Anderson (Cook), east half of the northeast quarter of section 28, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 80 acres.

Myron W. Anderson, southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 33 north, range 7 west, and southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 24, township 37 north, range 11 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 80 acres.

Maude Marie Anderson (LeFebvre) southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 33 north, range 7 west, and southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 24, township 37 north, range 11 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 80 acres.

Collins Anderson, Jr., southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 36, township 33 north, range 7 west, and lot 4 of section 30, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing seventy-nine and eighty-two one-hundredths acres.

Sec. 2. Said patents in fee when issued shall contain a reservation to the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians of the oil, gas, and all other mineral deposits as provided in the Act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed,

and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 8877) was laid on the table.

LOWELL HARRIS SPOTTED ELK AND BENJAMIN SPOTTED ELK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6698) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lowell Harris Spotted Elk and Benjamin Spotted Elk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Lowell Harris Spotted Elk and Benjamin Spotted Elk, of Winner, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the following-described land situated on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota: Allotment No. 5720, northwest quarter, section 23, township 41 north, range 28 west, of the sixth principal meridian, South Dakota, containing one hundred and sixty acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell, upon application in writing by the heirs, the trust allotment No. 5720 of John Spotted Elk, deceased Rosebud Sioux allottee, described as the northwest quarter, section 23, township 41 north, range 28 west, of the sixth principal meridian, South Dakota, containing one hundred and sixty acres, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds under supervision to the heirs."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the sale of certain inherited land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF CERTAIN LAND OF CHARLES RED HORSE ON THE ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6701) to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land of Charles Red Horse on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell at the highest competitive bid the trust allotment No. 4566 of Albert Crooked Foot, deceased, Rosebud allottee, described as the northeast quarter of section 15, township 100 north, range 74 west, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Charles Red Horse, legal heir to this allotment, for his benefit: *Provided*, That the proceeds shall be regarded as trust funds and shall not be subject to liens or attachments of any character whatsoever except obligations due the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell at the highest competitive bid the trust allotment

No. 4566 of Albert Crooked Foot, deceased, Rosebud allottee, described as the northeast quarter of section 15 township 100 north, range 74 west, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Charles Red Horse, legal heir to this allotment, for his benefit: *Provided*, That the proceeds shall be retained as trust funds and shall not be subject to liens or attachments of any character whatsoever except obligations due the United States.

"Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Rosebud Sioux Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 90 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 90 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 90 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Rosebud Sioux Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 90 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENT IN FEE TO ALICE BEAR SHIELD KNOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6875) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Alice Bear Shield Knock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Alice Bear Shield Knock, of St. Francis, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the following-described land situated on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota: Allotment No. 4654, lots 3 and 4 and the east half of southwest quarter, section 6, township 95 north, range 78 west, of the fifth principal meridian, South Dakota, containing 161.46 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell the trust allotment numbered 4654 of Alice Bear Shield Knock, Rosebud Sioux allottee, described as lots 3 and 4 and the east half of southwest quarter, section 6, township 95 north, range 78 west, of the fifth principal meridian, South Dakota, containing one hundred sixty-one and forty-six one-hundredths acres, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Alice Bear Shield Knock for her benefit."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1192) for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Francisco Marmaun-Villaneuva, Javier Ochoa-Luna, Gabino Esquivel-Lequeneche, Estaban Cordova-Juaregui, Julian Hormaechea-Hormaechea, Miguel Alluntis-Asla, Serapio Zabala-Arrien, Sabino Gonzales-Baron, Soverino Juanarena-Ituralde, Juan Abadia, Javier Aberasturi, Pedro Aberasturi, Juan Aincioa, Lorenzo Aincioa, Lorenzo Alacano, Victoriano Andonegui, Maximo Argoitia, Gregorio Arrizabalaga, Leocadio Arrizabalaga, Silverio Artiach, Jose Asumendi, Gregorio Barruetabena, Jesus Barruetabena, Teodore Basabe, Jose Basterrechea, Lino Belausteguigoitia, Juan Beristain, Pedro Bilbao, Eugenio Cordoba Calvo, Fidel Calzacorta, Elias Calzada, Vincente Capanaga, Eugenio Cartago, Eugenio Cizur, Matias Cobeaga, Alejandro Duero, Jose Echegaray, Manuel Echegaray, Jesus Echeita, Andres Echevarria, Juan Domingo Emandia, Jose Luis Erquiaga, Rafael Fogoaga, Mariano Gabicogogeoasca, Jesus Gabiola, Felix Garate, Paulino Garate, Juan Jose Garatea, Martin Gariza, Julian Garmendia, Damian Garralda, Jose Gonzalez, Antonio Guerricaechevarria, Juan Guerricaechevarria, Lucio Guerricaechevarria, Juan Guezuraga, Augustin Gurbindo, Juan Inda, Jean Martin Irigoyen, Antonio Iturri, Esteban Iturri, Lucio Iturri, Claudio Izaguirre, Luis Jayo, Roman Jayo, Arsenio Jayo, Fidel Joraguria, Cesareo Dufur Juanarena, Alejandro Juancorena, Tiburcio Juancorena, Jose Juaristi, Juan Landa, Paulino Landa, Benito Larrea, Constantino Larrinaga, Pedro Larrinaga, Felix Larrucea, Marcelino Laritategui, Estaguio Laucirca, Pedro Lazuen, Juan Francisco Lejarza, Miguel Marizcurrena, Eugenio Martija, Vincente Mendiolea, Victor Mirandona, Marcel Mocho, Antonio Monasterio, Bartolome Monasterio, Telesforo Muguerza, Antonio Munategui, Jose Antonio Olabarrieta, Miguel Olano, Andres Olavarria, Luciano Olea, Pedro Onarte, Jacinto Ondaro, Pedro Artiach Ondarza, Francisco Otazua, Luis Paternain, Francisco Redin, Emilio Ricondo, Fernando Ruiz, Jesus Sanmiguel, Saturnino Santesteban, Domingo Santos, Jose Maria Sarasua, Alfonso Sario, Ramon Presto Sario, Pierre Sarry, Miguel Solaguren, Jose Antonio Telleria, Santiago Uriarte, Daniel Urien, Pedro Urguidi, Jose Urrutia, Pablo Urrutia, Anastasio Urzas, Marcos Urza, Cesareo Vara, Antonio Villanueva, Martin Villanueva, Jose Yanci, Pedro Zabala, Nicolas Zatica, Ramon Zubillaga, Juan Guerricagotia Bengoechea, Prudencio Calzacorta Aguilopeziti, Raimundo Urrutia-Foruria, Jose Echevarriazarraga Ibarguengoitia, Antonio Morga Urresti, Simon Vidaguren Aguirre, Nicolas Vidaguren Aguirre, Julian Uruburu Inchausti, Jose Guerricabettia Iribar, Jose Bilbao, Fidel Lequeneche, Juan Larrinaga Irazabal, Jose Manuel Mendezona, Jaime Sangroniz Arriza-

balaga, Prudencio Echandia y Zabala, Jose Domingo Echandia y Zabala, Jesus Bilbao Legerburn, Manuel Basterrechea, Jose Echandia, Santos Aboitiz, Frederico Madarieta, Gregoria Silloniz, Felipe Albizua Calzada, Pedro Olano Filibi, Felix Lezamiz Guerequeta, Julian Muruaga Ispizua, Fermin de Bilbao Jayo, as of the respective dates of their lawful temporary entry into the United States between the years 1944 and 1949, if they are found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each alien named herein from the quota of the appropriate country of the first year that the said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREGORY PIRRO AND NELLIE PIRRO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1357) for the relief of Gregory Pirro and Nellie Pirro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Gregory Pirro and Nellie Pirro, of Wildrose, N. Dak., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head taxes and visa fees.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Italy.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELMER BELLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1528) for the relief of Elmer Beller.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

MARIA BALSAM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2324) for the relief of Maria Balsam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Maria Balsam shall be considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Ben Rose, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTURO BENETTI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2599) for the relief of Arturo Benetti.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Arturo Benetti, who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLO FAVA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2648) for the relief of Carlo Fava.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Carlo Fava, of Newton, Mass. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Carlo Fava shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

Sec. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Carlo Fava shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Italy.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIEKO MURATA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2922) for the relief of Chieko Murata.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Chieko Murata, the Japanese fiancée of Sgt. Donald G. Garrett, of Denver, Colo., and that the said Chieko Murata may be eligible for a visa as a non-immigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Chieko Murata is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. Donald G. Garrett, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chieko Murata, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917

(U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chieko Murata, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Chieko Murata as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER TYSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3015) for the relief of Walter Tyson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter Tyson, Jersey City, N. J., the sum of \$2,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Walter Tyson against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on February 14, 1944, when he was struck on Railroad Avenue, within the confines of the Bayway refinery of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, located at Linden, N. J., by a United States Navy vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. F. STEINER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3018) for the relief of W. F. Steiner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. F. Steiner, of Bayou la Batre, Ala., the sum of \$3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the destruction of his oyster beds in Oyster Bay, Baldwin County, Ala., as a result of dredging operations performed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIO JUAN BLAS BESSO-PIANETTO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3121) for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto, who entered the United States on May 21, 1946, shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 21, 1946, on payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN LEGION MARNE POST, NO. 28

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3250) for the relief of Marne Post, No. 28, American Legion, New Martinsville, W. Va.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over, without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DR. ZENA (ZENOBIA) SYMEONIDES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3321) for the relief of Dr. Zena (Zenobia) Symeonides.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Zena (Zenobia) Symeonides shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIKIKO ANZAI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3434) for the relief of Mikiko Anzai.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Mikiko Anzai, the Japanese fiancée of Yoshiteru Murakami, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Mikiko Anzai may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Mikiko Anzai is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Yoshiteru Murakami, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said

Mikiko Anzai, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Mikiko Anzai, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Mikiko Anzai as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BASILIO GORGONE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3917) for the relief of Basilio Gorgone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Basilio Gorgone, the husband of a citizen of the United States, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAMM LUMBER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3965) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill and also the next two bills on the Calendar, S. 3966, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.; and S. 3967, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust, be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

BERNARD SPIELMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8478) for the relief of Bernard Spielmann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the immigration quota limitations established under any law, Bernard Spielmann shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence. Upon admission of the said Bernard Spielmann to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the first available immigration quota for Germany.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, for the purposes of section 12 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Bernard Spielmann shall be deemed to have been born in Ecuador."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YAMAGUCHI MICHIKO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8834) for the relief of Yamaguchi Michiko.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Yamaguchi Michiko, a native of Japan, the fiancée of John Mikat, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Yamaguchi Michiko may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Yamaguchi Michiko is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said John Mikat, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Yamaguchi Michiko, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Yamaguchi Michiko, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Yamaguchi Michiko as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required fees and head taxes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY VALSAMIS DENDRAMIS AND VASSILI G. DENDRAMIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8868) for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of May 25, 1946, the date of their last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officers to deduct one number from the quota for Egypt and one number from the quota for Greece for the first year that such quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LENA VALSAMIS AND LUCY BALOSA VALSAMIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8869) for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entry into the United States upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officers to deduct one number from the quota for Egypt and one number from the quota for Greece for the first year that such quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ENID LOUISE NOBLE ROMICK, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9475) for the relief of Mrs. Enid Louise Noble Romick, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Mrs. Enid Louise Noble Romick, Jr., the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORIS PAUL VON STUCKENBERG AND WIFE, MARIA ALEXANDER VON STUCKENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2835) for the relief of Boris Paul von Stuckenberg and wife, Maria Alexander von Stuckenberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Boris Paul von Stuckenberg and his wife, Maria Alexander von Stuckenberg, as of April 18, 1949, the date on which they were lawfully admitted into the United States at the port of New York, N. Y. From and after the date of the approval of this act, and upon payment of visa fees and head taxes, Boris Paul von Stuckenberg and Maria Alexander von Stuckenberg shall be deemed to be lawfully admitted permanent residents of the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the quota for Russia for the first year that such quota numbers are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GEORGE PETER PETROPOULOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3306) for the relief of Dr. George Peter Petropoulos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Dr. George Peter Petropoulos as of October 6, 1947, the date on which he lawfully entered the United States upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Greek persons of the first year that such quota is hereafter available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLVIN BERNARD MEIK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3307) for the relief of Colvin Bernard Meik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Colvin Bernard Meik, a British Army officer who is presently residing in Great Britain, and who was born in India of British parents, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TATIANA MORAVEC

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3431) for the relief of Tatiana Moravec.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Tatiana Moravec shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KENNETH BRUCE KOHEI KOZAI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3824) for the relief of Kenneth Bruce Kohei Kozai.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Kenneth Bruce Kohei Kozai, the minor son of Mrs. Misato Kozai, a native-born citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be eligible for admission into the United States under the provisions of sections 4 (a) and (9) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF VARIOUS ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 102.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-7693367, Gibson, Ellen Pauline (nee Benson).

A-2689533, Burger, Hans Rudolf.

A-4592673, Kiladitis, Stamos Nicholas.

A-7544392, Lung, Wong Kam.

A-4532674, Poy, Tsz Fook.

A-7050910, Russos, Michael.

A-1717103, Stratis, Nicholas Costas.

A-2966189, Tsistinas, Panagiotis or Peter, or Peter Tsistinas.

A-2981686, Vavilis, George, or John Vavilis.

A-2531584, Argyridis, John, or Ioannis Argyridis or John Argyride or John Argyrides or John Odeseas Argyridis.

A-4580270, Chitas, Petros Demetrios, or Petros Chitas or Pierre Chitas.

A-5331520, Chung, Leung.

A-7117512, Cotsimopoulos, George Theohary, or George Kotsimopoulos.

A-9767746, Daratos, Nicholas, or Nick Daratos.

A-3762786, De Pinto, Cosmo Damiano.

A-4809973, Giannatos, Panayis Michael, or Panayis Michael Giannatos, Peter Giannatos, Peter Mihalle Giannatos, Panagis or Panagiotis Giannatos, Panagis M. Jlanatos, or Peter V. Jonhaatos.

A-5127595, Jakominich, Sime.

A-5470702, McDonald, Edwin Wilson or "Mac."

A-2175881, Papapanagiotou, Georges Vassili.

A-4342795, Perivolaris, Sotirios Ioannis.

A-5667865, Rotonde Francesco.

A-3588422, Varrias, Christos George, or Hristos Varias.

A-4614803, Vaz Querido, Manuel.

A-4780996, Wolke, Robert Paul, or John Lange or Johannes Lange.

A-7632722, Hoffmann, Ernest Jack, or Ernest Jacques Hoffmann or Ernest Jakob Hoffmann.

A-9836887, Capparis, Ambrose Alexander.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SECOND FRONT IN THE PEACE WAR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the current emphasis on the mobilization effort to arm us and our allies is only one-half the peace "war" which we have to fight. The other half is the peace "war" on the economic front. I believe it is necessary to seek "peace by investment" and that this will require an expenditure to balance the approximately fifty to one hundred billion dollars additional expenditure now contemplated for increases in our Armed Forces. Accordingly, I am today introducing a resolution expressing it as the sense of the Congress that there should be established an International Development Corporation—or a World Development Authority—with a capital of \$10,000,000,000 and a 50-year life, to

finance investment in development programs to expand and improve productive facilities for free peoples in agriculture, industry, and communications particularly in underdeveloped countries, and to improve education, health, and public administration.

My resolution recommends that consideration be given to undertaking part of this investment program through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which should organize a subsidiary for the purpose of making grants or low interest, long-term loans to finance basic developments, either as a preliminary to loans to be made by the International Bank or as a basis for private investment. This appears to me to be the best plan for squaring the need for wise investment policy and administration with the effort to get away from strictly United States grants or loans on the basis of programs like the European recovery program which may meet resistance, especially in Asia. The International Bank has developed an organization of missions for the purpose of assessing the capability of countries to receive investment and for the purpose of following through on the expenditures involved which has shown marked success. My resolution calls also for cooperation with the United Nations and for direct investment on the pattern already established for the Economic Cooperation Administration by the European recovery program. The major virtue of action through the International Bank is that this is a business agency at the same time that it is an international agency affiliated with the United Nations and can better appraise without being subject to as many political pressures, the desirability of investment, the needed terms for grants to lay the basis for an investment program and the opportunities for repayment.

The limitation of capital available for an investment program through the International Bank is best shown by its fifth annual report just submitted. Out of an availability for loans of slightly over a billion dollars, the bank has already made 32 loans totaling \$965,845,000. Other international investment is relatively small and mainly concentrated in the expansion of operations of existing American companies overseas.

I believe that all of us have been deeply concerned by events in Korea with the fundamental proposition that communism appears to arouse a kind of fanaticism giving men the will to fight and die though it is composed of spurious promises, intellectual slavery, and the extinguishment of all freedoms. Aside from police terror, which is coercion, one reason for its appeal would appear to be the fact that it at least promises reforms, which in areas of the world very urgently needing social and economic reforms, make a great stir. In Asia, questions of absentee landlordism and feudal systems of land tenure urgently need solution. The Communists offer a solution, spurious as it is, by collectivization of land and by forcible expropriation. This turns out to enslave the peasant and depreciates the yield but it does represent

a change from the past. The same is true in respect of health, education, and social security. Cruelly and brutally does the Communist regime make changes in these fields, but it is some change and commends itself to depressed peoples in view of their present abysmally low standards.

We know that we can actually deliver vast improvements in agriculture, health, education, and social security. We know also that we can bring about greatly increased production of consumer goods which depressed peoples so ardently want. In other words, we know that as against spurious Communist promises, we can produce tangible and effective results, but the teeming millions in Asia do not know that until we bring the results to them. This is equally true of South and Central America, Africa, and the Near East where chronically depressed standards of living, unbelievably low rates of food production per capital, and low standards of health and education also make good breeding grounds for communism. In short, we must deal with the causes which create breeding grounds for communism. It is not enough to mount the Armed Forces to defeat Communist aggression. That is only half the battle. Vast amounts of invested money are required for this purpose of economic development. Most of it can be invested on a valid basis, though not at present a bankable basis because large investment is required to establish the basic conditions upon which credit standing can be based.

A recent example is the \$18,500,000 loan of the International Bank to India for expansion of power facilities and mining. The loan prospectus makes clear that many times that amount of money is really needed but that projects are not yet available on a bankable basis.

I estimate the field for annual investment throughout the world under this program at about \$5,000,000,000 per year beginning in 1951, divided as follows: \$1,000,000,000 in the Far East; \$500,000,000 in the Near East; \$2,000,000,000 in western Europe; \$500,000,000 in Africa; and \$500,000,000 in South and Central America and in the Caribbean. Such an investment program may well have to continue for 50 years. I believe that we should be prepared to go through with it and in order to make it effective as the second front in the peace war, and that no strings about disarmament can be attached to it, such as have been attached to other plans. We have got to realize that this investment, if we want peace, is the essential corollary to mobilization expenditures. Of course, if we want a preventive war against the U. S. S. R. which I believe the American people are definitely against, then we need only to build up our Armed Forces but if we want peace, we must answer the Communists not alone with arms but with goods.

The American economic machine has been geared up to a vast output aggregating about \$275,000,000,000 a year. Our economy is operating at top speed

and the added requirements for increased defense preparations will undoubtedly utilize our full productive power for a time, but this time is limited to a period of a few years. And though thereafter maintenance requirements for our defense preparations will be large, they will certainly not be great enough to occupy the great industrial machine we will have created to the full.

For example, even present estimates before the Congress show that the defense program currently will use annually only 4 percent of our total annual steel capacity or 4,000,000 tons, 7 percent of our copper supply, or 160,000 tons, and 14 percent of current aluminum production, or 100,000 tons. We are bound to face a day when this industrial machine will be capable of producing a huge surplus.

It will take from 1 to 3 years to suitably develop a program for foreign investment. We are just getting started on the so-called point 4 program under the Act for International Development provided for in Public Law 535 and investment opportunities will begin to open up very materially. Starting now with adequate capital to be able to meet these investment needs it would put us in a position to keep the American economy operating at a high level for 50 years to come.

The Jeremiahs will say, "What if a world war comes." Of course, if there is another world war an investment program such as I am proposing must be deferred and our whole economy geared to war needs, but what we want is to avoid a war and the opportunities for the world presented by such an investment program would be in my view as powerful a weapon for peace as the expansion of our Armed Forces and the development of the armed forces of the other cooperating UN powers. Though the program may take time to get under way much can be done now, and the assurance it holds out to the depressed peoples of the world is far more persuasive than fake Communist promises.

It is most significant that the program for rural reconstruction inaugurated in China as late as 1949 and following these lines of technical assistance and investment was hailed as the most constructive action taken by the United States in its relations with China incident to the civil war between the Nationalist and Communist forces. With the whole world in transition it is a time for great, not small, alternatives. My resolution seeks to balance our military efforts to preserve the peace. It seeks to present to the peoples of the world whom we wish to keep free the other half of a program typically American in concept. They know that our greatest genius is production. We offer to share the benefits of this genius with them on the basis of self-help and mutual cooperation and thereby give them a great goal to fight for so that they may realize and enjoy the well-being which comes from production.

I recognize that it is late in the session, but when Members go home they will

find Americans deeply troubled about whether the only alternative we see in the present situation is another world war. My introduction of this resolution is intended to stimulate thought and discussion, so that we may be ready to launch our economic offensive to accompany our military preparedness in the Eighty-second Congress. The text of the resolution follows:

Concurrent resolution to provide a program for peace by investment to accompany the provision of Armed Forces for peace

Whereas the United States is engaged with other free peoples in a great struggle for democracy and the rights of the individual against communism and the master state; and

Whereas by virtue of its resources, its power, and its moral prestige, the United States is considered a leader of the free peoples in this struggle; and

Whereas the development of the industrial age has led whole peoples to believe that chronic poverty is no longer necessary and has made the economic well-being of peoples a crucial factor in determining whether they will follow democracy or communism; and

Whereas it is essential to the security of the free peoples that they shall have the incentive, the will to fight and the means to defend themselves against the aggression of the U. S. S. R., its satellite or puppet states and regimes, and against the infiltration of Communists; and

Whereas it is necessary that the United States should consider and develop its policies for the improvement of the standards of living of the free peoples and the economic development of underdeveloped areas in the interests of the peace and security of the United States; and

Whereas the European recovery program will come to an end with the fiscal year 1952 and certain fundamental economic problems due to the economic dislocation and the destruction of World War II affecting the most powerful free peoples organized in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation will continue thereafter; and

Whereas the problems of the free peoples of the Far East, the Near East, Africa, and the Americas require also for progress toward their solution, similar organizations for self-help and mutual cooperation; and

Whereas the Act for International Development (point 4) is excellent but inadequate to the resolution of the vast problems of economic development essential to victory in the struggle against communism; and

Whereas investment in productive resources is the most effective road to the improvement of standards of living, the reconstruction of war-torn economies, the development of underdeveloped areas and the economic development of the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas considering the magnitude of the problems involved, the United States should contemplate a total large-scale investment program with a life of 50 years; and

Whereas such an investment program should be effected through the cooperation of the Government and the private economy of the United States; and

Whereas such an investment program has the capabilities for modernizing and rebuilding the United States and stabilizing our prosperity for 50 years; and

Whereas our experience has shown that investments in productive facilities are sound and rarely involve serious capital loss: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress, in its determination to make its full contribution to peace and security for the people of the United States and the free peoples of the world, proposes that peace by investment become an integral part of our foreign policy.

SEC. 2. As a positive affirmation of our faith in the world's free peoples, and to carry on a peace offensive based on the principle of peace by investment, the Congress declares itself as favoring: (a) The establishment of an International Economic Development Corporation (or a World Development Authority), with a capital of \$10,000,000,000 and a 50-year life, and powers adequate to finance investment in development programs directly designed to expand and improve productive facilities in the fields of agriculture, industry, and communications, to promote improvement in education, health, and public administration, and generally to raise standards of living and encourage the creative energies of the free peoples to develop prosperity and freedom for themselves, in accordance with the principles of a private economy. (b) Investment in whole or in part of its resources by the International Economic Development Corporation (or World Development Authority) in or through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or its subsidiaries or affiliated organizations, for the purposes specified in (a) above and for the making of grants where required preliminary to or to lay the groundwork for development and investment programs. (c) The participation of other free peoples in financing such development and investment programs; and to cooperate with other United Nations agencies and organizations in connection therewith. (d) Action by the International Economic Development Corporation (or World Development Authority) to enlist in its efforts United States business, labor, and agriculture and with their cooperation and aid to make available for the benefit of the free peoples of the world our vast production and technical skills conscious of the fact that the art of peace can only be practiced through the arts of peace, and that commerce, industry, and trade for all free peoples on a foundation of freedom is the guaranty of the future that we seek to establish.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include statements, excerpts, and tables.)

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT—MODERN LOBBYING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Members to a copy of the hearings before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. This report is headed "Lobbying, direct and indirect" part 5, Eighty-first Congress, second session, Committee for Constitutional Government, June 27, 28, 29, and August 25, 1950. It contains 486 pages and it reveals the methods and policies used by the biggest lobby organization on earth to mislead and deceive the American people while at the same time enriching themselves. If all of the officials of this organization received as much money as Edward A.

Rumely, the executive secretary, has received in recent years, all of them are very rich men. Take, for instance, on page 444 of this report it discloses how a radio program was conducted. The name of it was "Americans, Speak Up." In June 1949 it was started. On page 445 it gives the program numbers and the names of the people who put on the program. I venture to say that the people who listened to this broadcast did not even suspect that it was carried on by the most vicious lobby on the face of the earth, headed by a man that you would not think of being used as a teacher in the public schools. Suppose a man like E. A. Rumely should apply for a position as superintendent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Since the gentleman spoke up, it reminds me that he had in his statement last night that Mr. Pettengill, to whom I referred, was a Democrat. I will admit that he was in Congress as a Democrat one time, but he changed his politics and became chairman of the Republican Finance Committee. I am sure it was 1936. He has not been a Democrat since that time. In fact, I do not think we will claim men who have done as he has done as members of our Democratic Party. He became a turncoat. He left our party completely and went over to the Republican Party, and has been there ever since.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that at least as long as the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Pettengill, who was a Democrat, elected as a Democrat, and who served as a Democrat, was in the House, he did have the respect and confidence of the Members of the House regardless of party?

Mr. PATMAN. He was a very reactionary person as a Democrat.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He was a good citizen, though. As usual the gentleman evades a direct answer. Mr. Pettengill served four terms, or 8 years, when he refused to be a candidate in 1939.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not see how you could reconcile his reactionary views with the platform of the Democratic Party. I always wondered about that. Finally he showed his real colors by quitting the Democratic Party and going over to the Republican Party.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman did not consider that an act of repentance and reformation?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, I cannot interpret his intentions or motives. That is beyond my ability.

In further reference to this book on the lobbying activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government, if you will go through this book you will find some of the most artful ways of deceiving the people that have ever been discovered. This book is very revealing.

For instance, this man Rumely contacts people by trades and professions. In that way he can appeal to them and never cause the others to be opposed to what he is saying. He writes letters to the presidents of railroad companies and makes a particular appeal just to them. Then he writes a letter to just the lawyers. He makes a particular appeal just to the lawyers. Then he writes a letter to the doctors. These letters are calculated to and do cause these people to think less of their Government all the time.

During World War I, as I showed yesterday, this man was operating a newspaper owned by the German Government, a big daily newspaper in New York City. He was hired by the German Government, paid by the German Government, carrying on a newspaper in favor of the German point of view, admittedly for the purpose of slanting news in favor of Germany and against the Allies.

I started to say a while ago when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] interrupted me that if you were on the board of school trustees and a man by the name of E. A. Rumely should place his application before you for the place of superintendent of schools, you would not consider him for a minute.

MASS-THOUGHT CONTROL

If you were a member of a church and he was being considered for a prominent position, or as the pastor in that church, you would not consider him for a minute, because you do not want a man like that, a man who has tried to control thoughts in America in his direction. Why would you not consider him for a minute as your superintendent of schools or as the pastor of your church? For this obvious reason, that he has been in a business which is not according to the American way of life. It is an attempt at mass-thought control. That is the business Rumely has been in ever since he left Germany. He has been engaged in mass-thought control. I guess he is the only man who ever attempted it on such a large scale. Therefore, you would not consider a man who for 14½ months while our country was at war during World War I, and when our boys were dying upon the field of battle, was deceitfully operating a big newspaper here in the United States which was owned by an enemy of the United States, an enemy with whom we were at war. You would not consider a man like that at all, neither for pastor of your church nor as superintendent of your schools. Therefore, why should we pay any attention to the literature that he gets out and floods into the homes and churches and schools of America? He is not the right man to have charge of any effort at thought control in the United States of America, a democracy. I know a great many people say we have a republican form of government and that it is not a democracy. William Tyler Page, who was the author of the American's Creed, a statement of exactly 100 words, received for writing it a prize of \$10,000. That statement of the American's Creed

was endorsed and approved by the House of Representatives.

A DEMOCRACY IN A REPUBLIC

The American's Creed, by that great man, William Tyler Page—and he was a great man—contains the phrase, "A democracy in a republic." And that is exactly what we have in this country—a democracy in a republic. I hope everyone who can and will, will inform themselves of the people who are really running and operating and supporting financially this most vicious lobby ever organized on the face of the earth. If people knew what was behind it they would pay no attention to that literature. But you will not see much in the press about this matter at all. If you notice, very little is ever carried on the other side. There are probably some good reasons for that. The only way we have to get out the other side of the story is through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and through reprints of statements made on the floor of the House, and things like that.

RUMELY ET AL. V. UNITED STATES

If you want to study this Rumely case, I invite your attention to the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit of July 22, 1923, in the case of *Rumely, et al. v. The United States* (293 Fed. Rept. 532). It is about 30 pages long. In this opinion of the circuit court of appeals, you will find the Rumely case thoroughly discussed. You will find the charges which were entered against him by the grand jury of New York, and you will find the decision of the court after the jury had found him guilty. You will find the charges he has been found guilty of. There is a long discussion of the actual facts of the case. It was shown conclusively and the jury so found that E. A. Rumely had by some hook or crook received over a million dollars in cash from the Imperial German Government and paid that money for the New York Evening Mail.

It was done in a way to make it appear that American citizens owned that paper, when American citizens did not own one penny of stock in the newspaper. It was owned by the Imperial German Government and operated by E. A. Rumely in time of World War I, obviously and admittedly for the purpose of slanting the news for Germany and against the allies in that war.

In the first place, why should people like that be allowed to operate at all? But in our country, we believe in liberties and rights, and we will tolerate many things that they do not tolerate in other countries. How long would Rumely last in a country like Russia or in any country in charge of a dictator? He would not last 1 minute. But in this country we submit to things like that because we do not want to be in the position of denying anyone any civil rights, any freedom, or any liberty.

The question is: Why should we let him operate at all? But we are not trying to stop him and his vicious group that is around him. We are just trying to see who is behind what he is trying

to tell the people in his attempt at this mass thought control that he is carrying on. He got by one time by not disclosing to the people who was behind the New York Evening Mail during World War I. He got by with that. Finally, when he was sentenced and convicted and after he was in the penitentiary 30 days, he was pardoned. That is, his civil rights were restored, but that does not remove his guilt at all. It simply restores his civil rights. But if we are going to have mass thought control in this country, we should not have it operated by a man like E. A. Rumely.

I respectfully submit that if you will read this circuit court opinion, Two Hundred and Ninety-third Federal Reporter, pages 532-560, which you will find in any up-to-date library, or in most any lawyer's office throughout the land, it is a quick and ready reference to the facts in this case. I commend it to you for reading.

If you want to go further into it and learn more about it, I suggest that you get the Assignments of Error, 4 large books, about 8 inches high 2,139 pages and 249 assignments of error. These books have some revealing information in them too. Get a copy of the testimony and the exhibits, but I warn you now, you will have to go through a truckload of papers, because this case lasted 30 full court days. During that time they used 166 witnesses and 670 exhibits and therefore in record is voluminous. But I insist, if you study this record and you study the history of this man, you will come to but one conclusion, and that is that he was guilty of treason during World War I; guilty of treason. No one can study that record and not come to that conclusion, because that is the inescapable conclusion.

MODERN, STREAMLINED, HIGH-PRESSURE, AND WELL-FINANCED LOBBY

Every school and college in America should have a supply of the copies of the hearings on Lobbying—Direct and Indirect, before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. This book is part 5 of the hearings before that committee and it concerns the Committee for Constitutional Government, which is the most scientific and expertly managed and directed lobby in the United States.

This book discloses how such a modern, up-to-date lobby works by sworn testimony and copies of correspondence.

It would be well for every Congressman's constituents to be acquainted with the methods used; first, to try to deceive and mislead the people, and, secondly, to try to get the deceived people to mislead their Congressmen. In addition, every school and college should have a copy of the citation for contempt against Edward A. Rumely, the super-super international lobbyist, now confining his activities to trying to cause a depression in America so that a Fascist dictatorship can take control.

Any person who desires a copy of this book of hearings should write either to his Representative in the House, or to one of his United States Senators. I am sure the Committee on Lobbying Activi-

ties would very quickly supply the copies necessary to fill such requests.

CLAIMED JURORS MISUNDERSTOOD

The gentleman from Michigan on yesterday placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it appears on pages 15065, a statement of what he considers the facts in the Rumely case. In this statement, the following paragraph appears:

He was tried, together with two attorneys, law partners, of the well-known jurist Arthur Garfield Hays, for allegedly making a false report under the Trading With the Enemy Act in World War I. All three were convicted by jurors, five of whom later admitted that "it was our disposition to give to the Government [not to the accused] the benefit of whatever doubt existed."

It will be noted that the jurors were contacted very soon after the trial and some of them said that they thought the Government should be given the benefit of the doubt. The court's charge was very plain and clear on this point. It was as follows:

Now, this is a criminal case. The defendants are charged with a criminal offense, and, under our system, they are presumed to be innocent, even after indicted, until the evidence has been introduced, and they are entitled to that presumption of innocence until the jury shall have been convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of their guilt from it—and that is true of each of these defendants—they are presumed to be innocent until proven beyond a reasonable doubt to be guilty.

It is true also that you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt as to each of the elements necessary to constitute the offense of conspiracy. That is, you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt, first, that the money that was used to buy the Evening Mail or to finance it, was money of the Imperial German Government; next, you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants knew of it at or before the time that they made the report on December 4, 1917; and, lastly, that knowing of it, they acted in concert to suppress the true character of the transaction from the Alien Property Custodian, that is, that at least two of the defendants so acted.

Another part of the charge is very interesting. It is as follows:

Now, if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that under counts 4 and 5 there was a loan or an indebtedness outstanding at the time, either on February 3, 1917, or October 6, 1917, or at any time up to the time the report was made, in any substantial amount, and that that indebtedness was due from Dr. Rumely to the Imperial German Government, and not to Herman Sielcken; and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants or two of them know that to be the fact—knew that the indebtedness was due to the Imperial German Government and not to Herman Sielcken, at the time they made the report on December 4, 1917, and that they concertedly made a report to the contrary, knowing it to be untrue, then they should be convicted, if you believe that beyond a reasonable doubt, under counts 4 and 5 of the indictment.

There could be, however, no conviction under counts 4 and 5 of the indictment if you believe that the form of the transaction was not a loan, but a straight sale, because then the conviction if there be one should be under counts 1, 2, and 3. But if you adopt the form of the trans-

action as shown by the papers, to have been the actual transaction, and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt, as I say, that the money that was loaned Dr. Rumely either at the outset or thereafter, through the financing of the Evening Mail, was money of the Imperial German Government, and that there was a substantial indebtedness of that kind existing under the fourth count, either on the 3d of February 1917—one of the periods when a report was required to be made as to or at the time when the report was in fact made, December 4, 1917, or under the fifth count of the indictment, that there was a substantial indebtedness of that kind existing on October 6, 1917, which is the date charged in that count, due to the Imperial German Government from Dr. Rumely, and that the defendants, or two of them, knew of the character of that indebtedness and failed, concertedly and consciously to report it, then their guilt, as I say, would lie under the fourth and fifth counts of the indictment.

If you have a reasonable doubt as to any of those facts, then they would not be guilty at all, of course.

It will be noticed in the report of the case that Rumely was convicted under counts 4 and 5.

In the transcript of the record, the following appears:

Now, these are requested by Dr. Rumely's counsel, and I give them as part of the law in the case.

Mr. BALDWIN. Your Honor has charged most of them.

The COURT. I guess I had better read them all. I cannot separate them, unless you can [reading]:

"First. A defendant is presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by competent legal evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. This presumption of innocence accompanies a defendant throughout every stage of the trial and the burden of proving guilt rests upon the Government and never shifts to the defendant.

"Second. Unless the jury finds that every fact essential to the crime charged in the indictment against the defendant Edward A. Rumely has been established beyond a reasonable doubt, it must acquit him.

"Third. To convict the defendant Rumely, the evidence must be such as to leave in the minds of the jury no reasonable explanation which is consistent with the innocence of the defendant Rumely as to the crime charged in the indictment. In other words, the facts proved must not only be consistent with, and point to, his guilt, but they must be inconsistent with his innocence. If the evidence can be reasonably reconciled, either with the theory of innocence or guilt, the law requires that you give the accused the benefit of the doubt and adopt the theory of innocence.

"Fourth. In considering the effect of any evidence introduced at the trial, you must follow the instructions of the court as to the purpose for which that evidence was admitted, and in case the court has limited its effect to only one or two of the defendants, you must consider it as only against him or them.

"Fifth. These instructions of the courts are given you only for your guidance."

Mr. BALDWIN. Your Honor has charged that unquestionably. I withdraw it.

The COURT. All right.

In other words, the above discloses that one of the counsel for Rumely, Mr. Baldwin, was perfectly satisfied with the charge of the court concerning reasonable doubt and the guilt or innocence of the accused.

SYMPATHY

Rumely had tremendous support from German sympathizers and others in this country. It is, therefore, conceivable that there was terrific pressure brought to bear on every juror in the case after conviction to get statements favorable to Rumely. Influence was also exerted on public officials concerned.

In addition, one of the defendants in the case, who was convicted with Rumely, was a blind attorney by the name of Kaufmann. Considering the fact he was compelled to withdraw from Harvard College by reason of illness and as a result of his illness he lost his eyesight, and also considering the fact that notwithstanding the loss of his sight after the restoration of his health, he entered Columbia Law School from which he was graduated and thereafter took the bar examination and allowed to practice there would certainly exist in the minds of the jurors and the trial judge such a deserving person. Naturally, there would be a lot of sympathy for an attorney like that who was a defendant in the case, and in this case he having been convicted along with Rumely caused Rumely to receive any benefit that the blind attorney received. The jury in the case, the court said, was properly charged as follows:

If you believe a defendant is guilty, in spite of his previous good character, he should be convicted; but if you believe, after considering all the testimony, that there is a reasonable doubt of his guilt, by reason of his good character, then it would be proper to acquit him because of his good character.

So, it cannot be said that the jury was not properly charged in every way. There was no evidence that the defendants did not receive a fair and impartial trial according to the law and evidence.

LONGER BANKING HOURS

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I commented upon the policy of some of our larger banks staying open for business such a short length of time during the day. This statement attracted the attention of Mr. H. J. Stoddard, of Lansing, Mich., president of the Michigan National Bank, who wrote me as follows:

MICHIGAN NATIONAL BANK,
Lansing, Mich., September 16, 1950.
Hon. Wright Patman,
House Banking Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I was delighted to see your recent statement in which you said, "I deplore the practice of so many banks in adopting shorter hours."

About 3 years ago, our own bank reached the conclusion that it was a very serious injustice to have our doors closed at a time when the majority of the people could most conveniently transact their banking business. After some preparation, we shifted over to a full 6-day banking week, with hours from 9:30 a. m. to 4:30 p. m. The public acceptance of this additional service has exceeded our fondest expectations, and it has imposed no hardship on members of our staff.

The primary duty of a bank is, of course, to serve the public, as we deal wholly with their property. Unfortunately our business seems to have developed some traditions

which militate against adoption of a program to meet modern needs and conditions.

Cordially yours,

H. J. STODDARD, President.

I am also inserting herewith an advertisement by this bank concerning banking hours. It is self-explanatory:

MICHIGAN NATIONAL BANK

Banking hours: 9:30 a. m. to 4:30 p. m. every weekday. Saturday, 9 a. m. to 4:30 p. m.

These doors are open 42½ hours a week for your banking convenience.

No more rushing to the bank at inconvenient hours.

Banking hours for our customers have been increased from 27½ to 42½ hours per week—equivalent to two full banking days for your added convenience.

The longer hours are possible because of a complete modernization of bank methods and equipment. Our staff, however, is on a 40-hour, 5-day workweek.

Come in—enjoy the longer hours. Yes, come in any time to Michigan National Bank, Michigan National Bank, Battle Creek, Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Marshall, Port Huron, Saginaw. Assets over \$175,000,000. Member Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Complete bank and trust service.

SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON OF TEXAS

We are all proud of the fine job that our distinguished junior Senator, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, is doing as chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee. Labor, a national weekly newspaper published by the four brotherhoods here in Washington, in its Saturday, September 16, 1950, edition carried the following interesting article:

JOHNSON HAS CHANCE TO WIN FAME AS DEFENSE "WATCHDOG"—TEXAS SENATOR IS KEEPING FEET ON GROUND—HARDY HAS SIMILAR JOB IN HOUSE

In Both Senate and House, new "watchdog" committees have been given the job of seeing that Uncle Sam gets his money's worth for his billions of defense dollars.

Historians writing of the life of Harry Truman are likely to agree that his efforts as chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee in the Second World War had more to do with his winning the nomination for Vice President, which put him in the White House, than any other factor.

With defense spending again being stepped up, a young Senator from Texas has embarked on a similar effort. Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, is still in his early forties. He came to the Senate 2 years ago, following a primary fight which he won by something less than the skin of his teeth. The Big Four Transportation Brotherhoods undoubtedly gave him that razor-edge lead.

As chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, JOHNSON is setting out on a task which may win for him national prominence as it did for Truman.

KEEPING FEET ON GROUND

Up to date, he has indicated that he is keeping his feet on the ground. He has refused to hire a 10-story building or to put on a staff of 40 "executive assistants." Instead he seems bent on operating with a small appropriation and a small staff.

He has recognized the "importance of simplicity," as former Justice Brandeis put it.

JOHNSON has borrowed Donald C. Cook, Vice Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, as chief counsel and has announced he will borrow expert help from other agencies as he finds need for them.

His investigation will be no witch hunt, he has promised, and its chief function will not be to provide or to seek newspaper headlines.

PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITY

If he sticks to that, there is a good chance that his efforts will be of real service to Uncle Sam. President Truman has said defense spending will be stepped up to \$30,000,000,000 a year, so there will be plenty of opportunity for an alert "watchdog."

But the "experts" will be trotting up to his office by the hundreds. And so will the "public relations advisers" and all the others, ready to tell JOHNSON how to run his investigation, or just how to get his name in the papers. He will need a cool head to fight them off.

The first report of the subcommittee was a stinging attack on the "sleaze psychology" of certain of the "brass hats" in the Pentagon building.

SILLY POLICY OF MILITARISTS

It said the Defense Department has continued its sales at bargain rates of material left over from the last war, while buying similar items at market prices for the new defense effort.

The Munitions Board also came in for sharp criticism for its failure to step up the stockpiling of rubber.

JOHNSON called the attention of the Senate to the way rising prices are boosting the cost of Uncle Sam's defense effort. Commodities used by the Armed Forces have gone up 50 percent or more since last April, led by rubber with a rise of 161 percent. Fuel oil costs 30 percent more and some electrical devices used in aircraft are up 175 percent, JOHNSON reported.

The committee announced plans for several other projects, including a study of the rise in the price of cartel-controlled natural rubber and surveys of steel production needs, Alaskan defenses, ordnance production, and manpower.

JOHNSON is on the right road. "Will he keep going?" Washington, always inclined to be cynical, is asking.

HARDY HEADS HOUSE PROBE

Congressman PORTER HARDY, Jr., Democrat, of Virginia, as chairman of subcommittee of the House Expenditures Committee, is working along much the same lines as Senator JOHNSON.

Judging from the way the same Hardy subcommittee uncovered waste and shenanigans in the operations of the Maritime Commission, it is expected to do a good job in seeing that Uncle Sam gets his defense money's worth.

As labor reported at the time, HARDY's group had much to do with the abolishment of the old Maritime Commission and its replacement by a Maritime Board in the Commerce Department.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE PERSECUTION OF EDWARD A. RUMELY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is at least the fourth time within the last few days that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has made these now familiar charges against Mr. Rumely. Again, as on previous occasions, I call to his attention and to the

attention of the Members of the House a statement of the law to the effect that a pardon in this case was granted because the man was innocent should in the mind of any fair man, prevent a repetition of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. But first, I again repeat, as I did yesterday, and you will find the remarks in the RECORD—that after this conviction to which the gentleman has referred, the President of the United States, Mr. Coolidge, after consideration and after a report by the Attorney General, granted a full pardon to Mr. Rumely.

Let me read this from 39 American Jurisprudence, page 550, and there are many other authorities, including some from the United States Supreme Court, to the same effect:

In the case of a full pardon, it relieves the punishment and blots out of existence the guilt of the offender to such an extent that in the eye of the law he is innocent as if he had never committed the offense. So completely is an offense considered to be obliterated by a pardon that it has been held that pardon of treason or felony, even after conviction, will enable a man to have an action of slander for calling him a traitor or felon.

And this paragraph from the Supreme Court of the United States:

A pardon is an act of grace by which an offender is released from the consequences of his offense, so far as such release is practicable and within control of the pardoning power, or of officers under its direction. It releases the offender from all disabilities imposed by the offense, and restores to him all his civil rights. In contemplation of law, it so far blots out the offense, that afterward it cannot be imputed to him to prevent the assertion of his legal rights. It gives to him a new credit and capacity, and rehabilitates him to that extent in his former position (*Knote v. United States* (95 U. S. 149, 153)); *Illinois Central Railroad v. Bosworth* (133 U. S. 92).

There are other decisions to the same effect.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose in this case that he was charged with a minor offense and was pardoned for that, but in the testimony and the record that was made in the case in which he was convicted in the minor offense it disclosed clearly that he was guilty of a major offense, to wit, treason; would the gentleman say that the pardon for the minor offense would exonerate him of the major offense?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, of course not; I would not say that a pardon for assault and battery, if I may make such an application, would excuse a man for the commission of robbery or murder; of course not.

What the gentleman's argument amounts to and all that it amounts to is that the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the law enforcement officers of the United States of America during that period were criminally negligent in that they did not prosecute a man whom the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] now says and has repeatedly said was guilty of treason.

I do not want to be personal about this matter, but I suggest to the gentleman that if he is sincere in his convictions, if he thinks he is carrying on a holy crusade against this man whom he has referred to here so often as an ex-convict, I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that he go up in the judicial district where Mr. Rumely lives and make that charge openly and publicly where Mr. Rumely may get a chance to take the gentleman from Texas into court and have the truth or falsity of this charge established. This matter the gentleman has discussed time and time again, but he does not take it to a forum where Mr. Rumely can be heard where the truth or the falsity of his charge can be determined.

Mr. PATMAN. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In just a minute. The gentleman repeatedly makes this charge, and his remarks are almost always quoted in the political organ of the CIO which, if you recall as I recall, and as other Members of the House recall for years harbored Communists in official places, who had as their attorney a known Communist—we know now he was a Communist by his own admission, Lee Pressman. Pick up any issue you wish of the CIO or even of the A. F. of L. political publications and you will find quoted the remarks, made time after time on the floor by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] who is furnishing ammunition—ammunition not for the Democratic Party, but for the political organizations which have almost completely taken over the party organization of the Democratic Party. Before the gentleman acts as the evidence foundry—the production line of a smear campaign—let the CIO clear its own house of Communists and their sympathizers.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman brings up the point that the FBI and others were negligent because they did not charge Rumely with treason.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman's statement that Mr. Rumely was guilty of treason is true, that is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Looking at it from the most charitable view from their standpoint, I assume that they did not know the good case for treason that they had until after it went through the Supreme Court of the United States. And remember this, that was no New Deal court; that was a court appointed during Republican administrations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That was a court passing on the record as made. Now, instead of accusing them of negligence, the gentleman from Texas is accusing the FBI and the Department of Justice of ignorance.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am not doing that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then what was it?

Mr. PATMAN. They just did not have the information probably at the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right, then; if they were not negligent, if they were ignorant, they were just lazy. Their lack of information was due to a lack of diligence. The trial record, the court record were public records. The known facts evidently were not as the gentleman would like us to believe. Apparently they were not sufficient to justify any such charge as the gentleman now makes. I do not care which charge you care to make. There is something smelly somewhere, and I rather suspect it is not in this particular organization or in the home of the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Texas so often refers. I smell a smear campaign being now brewed by the staff of the House Committee on Lobbying for whom the gentleman from Texas seems to be the spokesman.

Now, you can make all the campaign material you wish and the CIO and its political organizations can print it as they have been doing as I assume they will, but I doubt very much whether you are going to get it into the minds of the people, come election day.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] referred to the Committee for Constitutional Government as the greatest propaganda organization in the country. He deliberately ignores the well-known fact that the present administration—yes; and several of its bureaus—have been spending far more money, and spending it illegally, for propaganda, than has the Committee for Constitutional Government and all known propaganda organizations operating in this country.

Brannan, Ewing, and dozens of others in the executive departments have been traveling about the country at Federal expense, using material collected through the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars. They have been doing it openly and brazenly for the purpose of promulgating their own ideas, reelecting to office candidates who will favor the policies they advocate.

Even the President had the nerve to make a political trip across the Nation at public expense and to call it "nonpolitical." It is doubtful whether anyone for one moment believed that that journey at the taxpayers' expense was other than political.

It takes monumental gall for anyone connected with the present administration to, from the well of this House, complain about a private organization misusing propaganda.

It seems I recall when a committee controlled by the majority party—the Democratic Party—reported the misuse of Federal funds for political purposes in the State of Texas. Another committee, if I am not mistaken, reported the misuse in the State of Kentucky of the taxpayers' dollars for political purposes in that State.

But there is an election on and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is again off on one of his so-called crusades. This time he seems to be making medicine for the CIO's Political Action Committee.

I would suggest that he look over that organization rather carefully and learn whether all of the Communists who have held responsible positions in it have been purged before he comes to the floor and attempts to tell others the way to avoid sin.

Now, we know that the President has always been against the Taft-Hartley Act, as is his right. He tried to prevent its passage. He vetoed it. Congress would not stand for that and passed it over his veto.

We know, after a conference between the heads of the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the President, along comes this request for the resignation of Mr. Denham. We know that under the law the President cannot remove Mr. Denham, because the Congress expressly wrote the law so that his removal was not subject to the will of the President as other officers are removable; nevertheless Mr. Denham upon request resigned. Let the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] tell us whether it is proper for Mr. Truman to scuttle the Taft-Hartley law by removing Mr. Denham, appointing a stool pigeon of the CIO or A. F. of L.

So what happens? We have these two labor organizations, and so far as I know no Member of the House would deny labor the right to organize and bargain collectively, but some of us do object to those organizations posing as labor organizations while carrying on strictly political activities, using the President of the United States as their tool to thwart the will of the people as written into the Taft-Hartley Act. So after this conference we find that the President of the United States apparently is under the thumb of the heads of those two labor organizations.

I say to the gentleman from Texas by way of kindly warning, although perhaps by his talks he has protected and insured his own future, perhaps my advice and warning should be directed to other members of the party, perhaps you will find in the Nation as the Democratic Party has found in Michigan that the labor organizations have taken over your party machinery and when firmly fixed and set in the seats of power, it will not be the Democrats of the South who are nominated and elected to the Congress. It will be members of the labor organizations.

You may find in the national picture as we found in Michigan where Gus Scholle, president of the CIO, says, "Do not vote for any Republican, no matter how able, how sincere, how honest, how patriotic. If he is a Republican, remember, union members, it is thumbs down." You may find that if you hold office it will be by consent of the union bosses. Just as Mr. Truman had to clear through Sidney Hillman, you may have to clear through the head of the local union in your district.

Shortly, when those union gentlemen get the power, you Democrats of the South are going to find it is thumbs down on you and the labor organizations will have their own candidates for the offices which some of you now hold.

XCVI—953

I hope from the bottom of my heart when that day comes the CIO will have purged itself as it has in part attempted to do, as in some instances it has done, of all those Communists who over the years, since the sit-down strikes in Michigan beginning on the 1st day of January, 1937, have dominated and controlled some of those unions.

Yes, I repeat, do not forget that Lee Pressman was general counsel of the CIO over the years. He was working hand in glove as we now know with another Communist in the National Labor Relations Board, Nathan Witt. Oh, what a wonderful little dovetailing organization. All working, not for the union or the Government which paid them, but for the Communists to whom they now admit they owed allegiance.

There are men in Congress on the Democratic side of the House like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] attorney for the unions, who have made an effort to get rid of those Communists and to get rid of the racketeers and the crooks who controlled the union organizations. What happened to the gentleman from Indiana and his subcommittee when he tried to expose some of the racketeers? Well, his committee was taken away from him and he was advised that he no longer had a committee, at least the power of subpoena was withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow, Thursday, and Friday for 15 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore granted.

GOOD NEIGHBORS DO NOT CHEAT EACH OTHER

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, to defeat communism abroad we must remove the economic causes that have fostered it.

The end of the eighty-first session of Congress is at hand. Its end is marked by an ever-increasing tempo of confusion and uncertainty in the United States and the rest of the world.

The situation of armed conflict in Korea and war clouds in other areas should indicate to the average citizen that our foreign economic policies have failed to provide the proper foundation for economic recovery and world peace. The billions of dollars which we have given out as doles to other nations have gained little in the way of friendship and economic stability.

Therefore the question, "Wherein have we failed?" is in order. In my opinion our foreign economic policy has been in reverse gear. We have permitted the continuation of a system of international trade, which is centuries old, to

exploit the weaker nations, thus perpetuating poverty and a lack of economic progress to serve as a stepping stone for socialism and communism.

Karl Marx in a speech at Brussels, Belgium, on January 9, 1848, on free trade closed it with these words:

But, generally speaking, the protective system in these days is conservative, while the free-trade system works destructively. * * * In a word, the free-trade system hastens the social revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade.

The present world situation proves the accuracy of Karl Marx's conclusion and in my opinion our foreign economic policy with its free-trade concept has aided communism.

Under the concepts of "free trade," society buys raw materials at the lowest possible level. This has the effect of destroying both the income from new wealth for economic expansion and the income which serves as a market for goods. The American policy has been one of protection, thus protecting the price of production and the income needed for economic progress.

At the present time the United States, with about 6 percent of the world's population, produces 25 percent of the goods and generates 45 percent of the dollar income of the world. Because of this 45 percent of the world's income which we enjoy, the United States consumes about 50 percent of all the mineral raw materials produced in the world. We produce about 50 percent of the steel and consume about 50 percent of the lead, copper, zinc, rubber, wool, coffee, and so forth, that the world produces. Some of the items, such as coffee, tin, sisal, hemp, jute, silk, and spices, we purchase entirely from other nations, and smaller amounts of other materials.

Stated in another way, we have become the economic cornerstone of the world and the United States must lead the world into a new era, not through a policy of "free trade" and exploitation, but with a program which will adjust foreign exchange and price levels to a par with the United States. The reason for this is quite obvious. The rest of the world cannot enjoy prosperity unless it is based on a prosperous United States. In turn, the United States cannot be prosperous on a price level which is determined by the slave labor in Russia and the impoverished world in the Far East which for centuries has suffered from exploitation under a system of colonial imperialism.

During the past few years I have followed with interest the efforts of Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, to revise our tariff system on a basis of equity of exchange. Under his proposal our price structure would be protected by a flexible tariff which would decrease in proportion to any adjustment upward of the price of imported products.

For example, if some product which we need is at parity with the American price level, the tariff would automatically be reduced to zero. Under such a system we could protect the prosperity of the

United States and assure stability for 45 percent of the world's markets. As the price of imports are adjusted to our price level it will increase the dollar exchange of other nations and at the same time make it possible for them to earn their own capital in a self-respecting manner instead of depending on the United States for doles.

To illustrate this point, I would like to call attention to our foreign trade in July 1950. The increase in the price of imports during the last 3 months has practically balanced our foreign-trade.

There is nothing mysterious in the improvement of our foreign-trade account. An increased price for coffee, tin, copper, cocoa, and many other items has given other nations the dollar exchange to pay for their imports from us.

In the last 10 years we have been practicing a domestic policy of parity prices for agricultural products. Our own economy reveals the interesting fact that each \$1 of gross farm production generates \$7 of national income.

It further reveals that a drop in national income follows the drop in gross farm income in the ratio of 7 times the loss in farm income. Unemployment ratios to the loss in farm income. In other words, if we wish to maintain a prosperous domestic economy we must provide an economic program which will pay an average of 100 percent of parity to agriculture which produces 70 percent of our raw materials or new wealth.

Recently this concept has been accepted by most of the automobile industries and incorporated in their wage contracts. Their labor is to receive an hourly wage in ratio to the cost-of-living index with an annual raise as compensation for expected efficiency of per man production.

Neither parity for agriculture nor the wage contracts in the auto industry can operate successfully under our present concept of foreign trade and a further reduction in tariffs. They can, however, operate successfully if we apply the parity concept or equity of exchange in our foreign economic policies.

The importance of a sound foreign economic policy of equity cannot be overstressed. Realism should force the conclusion that the Western Hemisphere is our first line of defense in the battle against the communistic ideology. Our first step in a sound foreign economic policy should be to notify the nations in the Western Hemisphere that we are going to stabilize our price level, which will permit the payment of present wage schedules and other cost factors. With this as a foundation, we should make such changes in our foreign economic policy as may be necessary to permit the payment of comparable prices for all the imports we may require from the Western Hemisphere to implement our own economy.

During the past 5 years the price level of our imports has averaged about 30 percent less than the price level of our exports. Our underpayment for our imports has approximated about \$2,000,000,000 per year.

Had we paid a comparable price for our imports other nations would have had the dollar exchange to pay for our exports. In addition, a comparable price for our imports would automatically stabilize the currencies of South America and other nations in ratio to the American dollar.

The underpayment prevented other nations in earning an additional \$2,000,000,000 of new capital with which to expand their economies and raise their standard of living.

The Inter-American Conference in Mexico City on March 8, 1945, passed the following resolution—subsection (b) of section I, Resolution 15:

That a fair and equitable relationship should be sought between the prices of agricultural and mineral products and those of manufactured articles and that all prices should be paid to producers and consumers alike.

This resolution is in strict accord with the suggestions I have made and can be implemented by a flexible tariff as proposed by Senator MALONE. If the program outlined by the resolution had been put in practice in 1945, the economic chaos which prevails today would have been replaced by confidence and economic progress throughout the world. In my opinion, we would not be at war with Korea and we would not stand in fear of another World War. Under such a program we would have equity of foreign trade instead of exploitation. Until we are willing to pay other nations a comparable price for our imports, we have no right to profess a good-neighbor policy. Good neighbors do not cheat each other.

With a program of equity in foreign trade, we can give the world true economic leadership in proving that a capital economy provides the prosperity and economic freedom which is needed as a foundation for civil and religious freedom. Strong nations must stop the exploitation of weaker nations through underpayment for their production. To defeat communism abroad we must remove the economic causes that have fostered it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the remarks he made at the American Bar Association Convention.

Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and insert a brief statement explaining the Senate amendments to H. R. 5226.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. CLEMENTE (at the request of Mr. WHEELER) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. FERNOS-ISERN (at the request of Mr. BARTLETT) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. FEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and insert extraneous matter.

Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article that appears in the Long Island News.

Mr. FUGATE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include newspaper excerpts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NIXON (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "How the FBI Trapped Hiss," which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$205.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and include in one an article, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$410.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include the Van Vliet report.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include letters, newspaper articles, and extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I received permission a while ago to insert in the RECORD the report that came through the Department of National Defense, including Lieutenant Vliet's statement. I find that it will exceed the legal amount and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$266.50. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted notwithstanding the amount.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS], I ask unanimous consent that she may extend her remarks and include a memorandum entitled "The Genocide Convention Should Be Ratified." She has received an estimate from the Public Printer that it will make six and one-fourth pages in the RECORD, at a cost of \$512.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that a communistic document approving this crazy genocide proposition they are trying to impose on the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not at all certain what it contains.

Mr. RANKIN. Who is requesting it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS]. I understand, as chairman of the International Committee, she has had the staff prepare a memorandum on the question.

Mr. RANKIN. Approving it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know what her position is on it.

Mr. RANKIN. Anybody who approves that thing ought to join the Communist Party and be done with it. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two affidavits.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 577. An act to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair;

H. R. 5101. An act to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation; and

H. R. 8847. An act to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2317. An act relating to the construction of school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes; and

S. 2822. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.),

under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 20, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Committee of conference. S. 3357. An act to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 3111). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOOD: Committee of conference. H. R. 9490. A bill to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3112). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee of conference. H. R. 6319. A bill to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 3113). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. Pursuant to 59 Stat. 434; without amendment (Rept. No. 3114). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3727. An act to authorize certain construction at Griffiss Air Force Base, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 3115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. Pursuant to House Resolution 66, first session, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 3116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 9693. A bill to extend the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to those members of the military and naval forces who are actively engaged in combat with the Communist elements of the Korean Government and who are not entitled to the benefits of the afore-mentioned act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9694. A bill to increase the compensation of the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, and the Federal circuit and district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 9695. A bill to provide for flood-control improvements on Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 9696. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Clark Fork and Pend Oreille Rivers by the States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WIER:

H. J. Res. 543. Joint resolution directing the Federal Communications Commission to grant licenses to certain radio and television stations in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution to provide a program for peace by investment to accompany the provision of armed forces for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 9697. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Martratt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 9698. A bill for the relief of Walter Klem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 9699. A bill for the relief of Albino Anta Y. Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9700. A bill for the relief of Silvestro Napoleon Ramos Canizal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9701. A bill for the relief of Antonio Novoa y Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9702. A bill for the relief of Manuel Bello Y. Llanes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 9703. A bill for the relief of Luigi Galzerano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2377. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Nellie Williams and other citizens of Jacksonville, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2378. Also, petition of Mr. E. G. Jackson and other citizens of Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven and in the earth and in the hearts of men, hallowed be Thy name. Without Thee, our striving would be losing. Our strength is unequal to our tasks. Undergird us, we beseech Thee, with Thy enabling might in the inner man.

May those who here serve the public weal be wise interpreters of the signs of the times, the brave spokesmen of Thy will and of Thy truth which sets men free from ancient wrongs. To us, in Thy providence, has been given a place of awesome responsibility in this